

VOLUME XIII

OCTOBER, 1927

NUMBER 6

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

REPORT ON UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

PUBLISHED BY

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

EDITORIAL OFFICE, 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD

CAMBRIDGE

MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes and Announcements

American Council on Education.....	374
National Student Federation.....	381
Carnegie Foundation, Annual Report.....	385
Pensions and Insurance, Extracts from Letter of President Pritchett.....	386
Doctorates in Science.....	387
Early Bulletins Desired.....	387

Educational Discussion

Determination of Fitness for College, <i>W. Farrand</i>	388
Youth of Today, <i>J. V. Denney</i>	391
What Should a Boy Going into Business Get out of Col- lege, <i>R. P. Angier</i>	394
Doom of the Arts College, <i>H. G. James</i>	397
Education for Democracy and the Junior College, <i>C. E.</i> <i>Seashore</i>	399
Research, <i>R. E. Rose</i>	404
Ozone in the Atmosphere of the American College, <i>M. M.</i> <i>Metcalf</i>	406
Chemical Research, <i>L. B. Mendel</i>	409
Segregation on the Basis of Ability, <i>H. W. Miller</i>	411
Time, Technology and the Creative Spirit in Political Sci- ence, <i>C. A. Beard</i>	414
Industrial Arts as a Social Study, <i>F. G. Bonser</i>	418
Confessions of a College Dean.....	420
The Absentee Professor.....	423
College Athletics: An Opinion, <i>J. S. Nollen</i>	424
Objectives for Intercollegiate Sport.....	426
Incidence of Pension Payments, <i>J. A. Estey</i>	427

Report on University of Louisville.....	429
---	-----

Local and Chapter Notes

Brown, "Knowing and Living," Course for Freshmen....	470
Chicago, Addresses to the Institute for Administrative Officers; Trustees' Annual Dinner to Faculties.....	471

TABLE OF CONTENTS

373

Minnesota, Educational Research.....	474
Rollins, Professorship of Books.....	476
Smith, Research Professorship.....	477
Washington, Faculty Participation in the Selection of a President.....	477

Membership

Members Elected.....	479
Nominations for Membership.....	480

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—The annual meeting of the Council was held at Washington, May 6 and 7, and is reported in the *Educational Record* for July, 1927.

"Dean H. E. Hawkes, Chairman of the Committee on Personnel Methods, briefly traced the growth of the work of this committee for the past five years. Because the problem is elusive, it required over two years to formulate a definite plan both for organizing the committee and for its work. Finally, in the fall of 1925 a grant of \$8500 was made by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s Benevolent Fund to enable the committee to make a survey of conditions in fourteen universities. President L. B. Hopkins' report on Personnel Procedure in Education published last autumn, was the result.

"This report makes clear that there is the widest possible variety of personnel practices in the several institutions studied. The universities are not yet talking a common language on the subject. Therefore, the committee applied for a further subvention that would enable it to establish a center of information through which institutions may keep posted on new developments, and which may also serve to develop cooperative experiments in this field. A new grant of \$20,000 a year for three years has just been made by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. for support of this program. The office of the American Council on Education will be made the center of information, and four cooperative experiments are planned.

"The four topics for these experiments are personal record cards, achievement tests, rating scales, and vocational monographs. A small committee of experts is being appointed to operate each of these experiments under supervision of the central committee. These committees will meet July 1-2 to organize and start the work. The general play of action is thus described in the letter to the Council stating the objectives of the grant:

"We understand that the Committee is satisfied that the next important step lies in the direction of making available to personnel workers, not only in the colleges but in schools, and industries, such record forms, test forms, and other instruments of measurement as have been sufficiently tried by competent specialists to warrant further, more extensive trials. We understand that the Committee believes that there are at least four phases of personnel practice in which sufficient preliminary experimentation has been done to make it possible to produce dependable model forms and instru-

ments of measurement which can be relied on to give dependable results and which will be of great value in revealing the intangible aspect of personnel work.'

"This work started informally as voluntary cooperation among fourteen institutions. Because it is obviously of general interest and application, it has been taken over by the American Council on Education. All members of the Council are invited to participate in the coming cooperative experiments and to make free use of the central news service which is now being developed. . .

"Professor J. P. W. Crawford, acting chairman, presented the report of the Committee on Modern Foreign Language Study in the United States. The work of this committee is nearing completion. Three volumes of its report are now in press. One of these deals with statistics of the subject from 18,000 high schools. Tables show the percentages of students studying modern foreign languages in different states and in various types of school. Similar data are given for teachers. A second volume contains results of the investigation into courses offered and designed for preparation of modern foreign language teachers. Another volume presents the findings of the experiments by Professor Ben D. Wood. New type tests were given to some 80,000 high school students and the results compared with those of old type examinations.

"Other volumes in preparation deal with the investigations of Professor Henmon concerning the construction and administration of objective and comprehensive tests for measuring achievement at the various levels of instruction and by various methods. The testing campaign and other special studies afford a basis for a volume on curriculum by Professor Algernon Coleman of the University of Chicago. This report centers about objectives and discusses test results for various semesters, length of course, achievement at various ages, kind of grammar and reading to be introduced at various levels. Professor Buswell has applied to reading modern languages methods already employed in determining reading habits in English. Other topics treated are the relationship between progress in language learning and mental ability as determined by mental tests, prognosis tests, and sectioning of classes according to ability, post-scholastic use of foreign languages by high school and college graduates, the requirement of a reading knowledge of French and German for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the relation of progress in modern language

study by students in high school and college idiom and syntax frequency, and work frequency.

"Members of the Council will receive copies of the several volumes of the report as soon as issued. Further copies can be purchased from the Macmillan Company. . .

"The progress of the American National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation was reported by the Secretary, Dr. Vernon Kellogg. After sketching the history and organization of the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation set up by the League of Nations, the establishment in 1925 of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation in Paris, and the appointment of national committees in thirty-two countries, Dr. Kellogg explained the organization of a small American National Committee, representative of our major intellectual interests. At the third meeting of this Committee, April 5, 1927, it adopted the following resolution (subsequently adopted by the League Committee):

Resolved: That the American National Committee suggests to the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation that it should consider whether the benefits of study abroad would not be greatly increased if each nation affording facilities for foreign students and teachers within its borders would establish, by public or private enterprise a central office whose function would be:

(a) To assist foreign students in finding and getting access to the educational facilities or research materials they seek;

(b) To help its own nationals find the educational opportunities they seek abroad;

(c) To keep corresponding offices in other countries informed concerning all phases of national education of interest to foreigners.

"To respond effectively to inquiries about the American intellectual life, the Committee has established headquarters at the National Research Council and appointed a part-time executive secretary, Dr. J. David Thompson. Such inquiries have included a program for an annual survey of intellectual statistics covering elementary, secondary, university, and technical education, learned societies, museums, libraries, archives, publishing, theaters, concerts, motion pictures, radio, inventions, and the liberal professions; a plan for an International Who's Who; a survey of post-graduate fellowships; cooperative studies of common national problems.

"The chief topic of the Saturday morning session was Recruiting and Training of College Teachers. The subject was presented by Dean O. E. Randall, Chairman of the Commission of the Asso-

ciation of American Colleges on this problem. The first report of that commission is printed in the *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges* for April, 1927.

"The commission has found that colleges are vitally interested in this question. Replies from 300 colleges showed that very little attention is given in graduate schools to preparing young men and women to teach. Scholarship and mastery of subject matter have been the chief aims. The public also does not appreciate the significance of the vital service college teachers render. Salaries are so low and recognition of the value of his work so lukewarm that teaching cannot compete long with other professions for the best talent.

"There is wide diversity of opinion as to what training is desirable for those who wish to teach. All agree that he must possess those subtle personal traits which make young people trust and respect him. It is doubtful if a graduate institution fashioned after schools of pedagogy will be of real service here. It might do more harm than good. Graduate schools are indifferent, if not hostile, to making provision for development of the most important element of success as a teacher.

"That there may be cooperation between graduate schools and colleges in this matter, the Association of American Universities has appointed three delegates to the Commission of the Association of American Colleges. The commission is inclined at present to look to some form of self-instruction in teaching directed by the faculty of each institution. Older teachers would visit classes and give younger teachers help and kindly suggestions. A sort of apprentice training on the job may be useful. Some central organization might formulate and distribute outlines of successful experiments in teaching or a carefully prepared program of procedure which a faculty might follow in such experimentation and study. This task is of sufficient importance to warrant creating a special organization to do this if no existing organization will and can do it.

"The commission has formulated six questions which it submits with the request that some organization with adequate facilities answer them. These are:

First: What proportion of college graduates during the period from 1921 to 1926 entered graduate schools with the intention of preparing for college teaching?

Second: During this same period what proportion of the highest

ranking graduates—say in the upper quarter of the graduating classes—selected teaching as a profession?

Third: What proportion of college graduates possessing in addition to scholarship highly desirable personal qualities chose teaching as a profession?

Fourth: Is there reason to believe that a smaller proportion of graduates of high scholastic standing and possessing exceptional personal qualities are taking up college teaching now than before 1917?

Fifth: Can some organization make a careful study of the economic conditions in the teaching profession with the view of ascertaining whether the profession is made sufficiently attractive to win the most desirable candidates?

Sixth: Is it worth while to ask Professor Thorndike to bring his study of Phi Beta Kappa men up to date with the view of ascertaining what proportion of Phi Beta Kappa men enter the profession of teaching?

"The discussion was continued by Dean W. E. Smyser, Chairman of a committee of the North Central Association on this subject. Dean Smyser presented a report which had been presented to the North Central Association in March and is printed in the June number of their *Quarterly*. The committee believes that at present it would be futile to recommend a blanket requirement of a number of hours of professional training for college instructors, both because men who could give the instruction are not available and because we have not yet enough factual information about college education to justify such courses. A questionnaire answered by 150 college teachers led to the following conclusions.

First: The typical teacher of freshman and sophomore college students has had little professional training for his work other than the study of the subject which he essays to teach.

Second: He is aware of meeting in the course of his work many educational problems in which he has had no formal training.

Third: He has confronted all these problems and some others in attempting to clarify his mind about educational issues.

Fourth: In spite of the little training he has had and his seven years of experience, he still finds about four-fifths of his problems unsolved.

Fifth: In about two-thirds of his problems he thinks he could have been helped by formal course instruction and is disposed to advise such professional training for graduate students preparing for college teaching.

"Another questionnaire addressed to college administrators elicited the fact that college administrators have little sympathy with

professional training of college teachers either before or after employment. Yet they desire vaguely that college instruction be improved. An analysis of the careers of all Doctors of Philosophy of the University of Chicago shows that 80 per cent have entered the teaching profession. The final summary of the study is stated as follows:

First: College administrators at the present time do not recognize professional training in education as a determining qualification for eligibility to appointment as an instructor in a college. There is some recognition of such training as a desirable supplementation to an otherwise qualified candidate.

Second: Graduate schools in the Association of American Universities do not, in general, make provision for professional training in the curricula leading to graduate degrees. Indifference to the need for such training is all but universal in these schools which aim to train their students for academic scholarship and productive research, even though the records show that such students are headed toward college teaching as a career. However much they may decry the obvious implication of available facts, graduate schools are clearly teachers colleges but as such they appear indifferent, if not hostile, to one element of a teacher's preparation which is now universally accepted as a requisite for a teacher's certification at every educational level below the college.

Third: Despite the indifference of college administrators and graduate schools to the claims of professional training, there is a clear recognition on the part of college instructors that such training in formal courses would be useful. These instructors find themselves confronted with difficult problems which academic training, intellectual ability and experience do not enable them to solve. They, therefore, feel the need for the formal consideration of these problems in courses prior to the time of appointment as college instructors, and would recommend the offering of such courses to graduate students.

"The committee is glad to cooperate with Dean Randall's commission and joins it in hoping that the American Council on Education or the Bureau of Education or some competent central agency will undertake to serve as a central news service and center of cooperation in this work. It is also their hope that a conference of all interested in this problem may be called in the fall to outline a sound program for united attack on the problem.

"Miss Eleanor Boswell, Executive Secretary of the American Association of University Women, presented a report of a committee of that Association on the related subjects of appointment,

promotion, and tenure of college teachers. Several years ago this committee was impressed by a study made by Smith College of its own conditions with regard to this matter. As a result a plan for a cooperative study was formulated and submitted to the American Council on Education with recommendation that the Council undertake the work. The questions which this plan propounded for solution were:

1. In determining promotion in a college faculty, either in position, or in salary, what should be the relative value given to teaching ability, productive scholarship, and administrative service, and what other factors should be considered?
2. What are the best evidences of productive scholarship?
3. How is teaching ability objectively tested?
4. Should length of service be given recognition?
5. What kind of record of the ability and of the achievements of its faculty members should a college keep?
6. What should be the procedure for determining promotion? Should promotion depend upon the recommendation of one's immediate superiors in the department? What is the place of a faculty committee on promotion, and what should be the relation of this faculty committee to the board of trustees?

"At the meeting last month the committee on standards of appointment and promotion again urged that the American Council on Education undertake this work and pledged hearty cooperation in a joint undertaking of this sort. Therefore, on behalf of the American Association of University Women, Miss Boswell urged that the American Council on Education appoint a committee to secure cooperation of all interested in a united attack on this problem.

"The Executive Committee reported in regard to the Personnel Register as follows:

"Careful attention has been given this year to the operations of the personnel register. By rigid economies its cost has been reduced from \$9000 to \$7600. The number of calls has diminished from 345 in 1924-25 to 251 in 1926-27. Only 91 of our institutional members have made use of the mail service, and 14 have personally consulted the files. Your Executive Committee is satisfied, after four years' trial of this experiment, that such a Personnel Register cannot be effectively operated for less than \$20,000 a year. Serious efforts have been made, but without success, to secure a special subsidy for the Register. This impersonal method

of handling a very personal matter does not seem to appeal to those who might grant support. Obviously, the Council cannot put two-thirds of its income into this project, and the expenditure of \$7500 on necessarily inefficient service is most wasteful. Therefore the committee recommends that the Personnel Register service be discontinued.

"This recommendation does not contemplate destruction of the files. These will remain available for consultation by college executives or for statistical studies. It means merely discontinuance of the annual check-up and of the mail service by which copies of registration blanks are sent in response to inquiries by letter.

The American Council has voted to transfer the duties and responsibilities of its Committee on the American University Union to the Institute of International Education and to discontinue its activities in the field of international education.

NATIONAL STUDENT FEDERATION.—The National Student Federation of the United States of America has issued its year book for 1926. Its membership includes 180 colleges and universities, and 19 others as associates.

At the first conference at Princeton, in December, 1925, the chief subjects were International Relations, with a nearly unanimous vote in favor of the entrance of the United States into the World Court, and permanent organization.

At the second conference at Ann Arbor, December, 1926, addresses were made by Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, on "European and American Educational Systems;" by Professor Alexander Meiklejohn, on "Outstanding Problems in American Education;" and by Dr. Henry N. MacCracken, on the "Student's Part in Education."

Various significant reports were made by student committees:

Report on Student Government.—"The function of student government is to deal with matters pertaining specifically to the student body as a whole, to cooperate with the faculty in matters involving both groups. The ideal student government should come from the student body, because of willingness to assume responsibility, and should not be a faculty imposed organization to take over administrative details too heavy for the faculty to carry.

"The means of functioning, as decided by a majority vote, should be faculty-student cooperation in all matters of student government. A minority believed that students should have complete responsibility

and control over all matters pertaining directly to students, and faculty-student cooperation in matters involving both factions.

"Student councils should be organized in such manner as to give representation to student leaders and to all factions of the student body. The place of the faculty in the mechanism of student government should be advisory, by representation on the student council, or in joint committees on which both students and faculty sit. It was also considered advantageous to have student members on various appropriate faculty committees, such as those instituted for purposes of discipline or for regulation of campus activities. In this connection liaison with boards of trustees in particular cases was also recommended.

"The problems to which student government might well extend its control were outlined as follows: interclass contests, elections, freshman regulations, administration of its own funds, alumni entertainment, mass meetings and chapel speakers, social legislation, the control or inauguration of new organizations and activities, the superintendence of social activities, including the arrangement of a social schedule, the convergence of the faculty-student viewpoint on all matters connected with the college or university, and the judicial powers to the extent of recommending expulsion. The question of control of athletic policy by student government was found to be impracticable in most larger institutions because of the weight of detail connected with the work and the necessary continuity of policy from year to year. Whether a student council should extend its scope to the regulation of profit-making campus activities was a question on which no definite decision was reached, with the preponderance of the sentiment in favor of such control in most instances."

Report on the Honor System.—"It was the majority opinion that it is advisable to have an Honor System because the good features and benefits of such a system overbalance the bad features, such as the odium of reporting fellow students and the responsibility of upholding the conduct of fellow students.

"Having agreed that the Honor System is a good thing, a discussion of methods and mechanics of systems revealed the fact that the systems are run differently in all colleges. . . not only that each school must work out a system to meet its own peculiarities but that there is a vast difference of opinion on ways of handling the matter of reporting breaches of honor. Methods of reporting range all the way from wholly personal action to a complete absence of the personal element

and it seems to be so much on a basis of personal taste that it is impossible to decide on any one method as being the best. There seems to be an even division also in the matter of whether the same body in a college should handle both student government and Honor System affairs, and as to whether the two should be distinguished.

"The chief problem which confronts those who would have a perfect system is that of creating in the student body a spirit of honor and an unswerving resolution to put the system into effect. In the discussion of the possibilities of educating untrained people into a sense of honor, it was pointed out by our expert that honor is not an innate quality of human beings but rather that a sense of honor springs from the environment and is dependent upon the teachings and surroundings of the individual. It was further shown how persistent education, and trust placed in the students had led to the gradual perfection of Honor Systems at several colleges.

"The final outcome of the discussion was that it is nearly always possible to install an Honor System in a college or to perfect the one already established. This is not to be accomplished, however, without an enormous amount of work directed toward educating the students up to a proper regard for honor and placing in the students an abiding trust and confidence which will be an incentive for their individual use. An Honor System cannot be installed or perfected in a single year...rather it must develop perfection through several years of unceasing care."

Report on Nature of the Curriculum.—"The Committee is of the opinion that the college can and should do much more to stimulate greater intellectual curiosity. It can accomplish this end by giving more responsibility to students, by relying more on the individual initiative of the student. In giving more responsibility to the student, the college must do more to arouse intellectual curiosity in the first two years so that in the last two the student will realize the significance of this responsibility, which will in turn bring forth greater initiative.

"Among the specific problems in the curriculum, such as marks, honors courses, required subjects, and comprehensive examinations, the question of examinations received the greatest attention.

"This Committee is of the very decided opinion that student thought has value in the educational policy of the college. Several colleges have incorporated in their new curricula some of the suggestions of the undergraduate committees on education. The Com-

mittee believes that unless college administrations have a sufficient sympathetic appreciation of undergraduate inquisitiveness, the college cannot progress as rapidly as it should."

Report on Athletics.—"The Committee discussed fully the place of athletics in college life, summing up its ideas in the unanimous resolution which reads: the Committee favors the policy of athletics for all students, and the promotion of inter-class and intra-mural athletics. As a supplement to this, the Committee recommends that no coach be paid a higher salary than that of the highest paid professor. This resolution is the result of a definite feeling on the part of the Committee that football is receiving undue emphasis, that too much attention is paid to the development of eleven men to represent the university, and that the real purpose of athletics, namely, the widespread and general development of students as a whole is still being neglected.

"The question of commercialism in sport, and especially football, was fully discussed, and the Committee expressed as the consensus of its opinion that: (1) Intersectional post-season football games are harmful to the colleges concerned when promoted by commercial interests, and when the extension of the football season interferes with the academic work of the students. (2) Each candidate for an athletic team should be required to make a pledge at the beginning of the season that he will not 'turn professional' until his class in college has been graduated.

"The opinion of the Committee was that alumni interference in college athletics is objectionable. This is not to be construed as opposing alumni representation on boards of athletic control. It is aimed at the great body of alumni who demand winning football teams and through unethical methods secure athletes for the team of their alma mater. These alumni, it was felt, often demand the scalp of a coach who has not produced a winning team, regardless of whether that coach has made the best of his material, or has given the men under him the best sort of athletic training. Among the suggestions for eliminating undue alumni influence were: the placing of entire control in the hands of a Director of Athletics who shall be answerable only to the President and trustees, and who shall be assisted by a committee on which are represented students, faculty, and graduates; (2) strict eligibility regulation with no concessions made to any student because of athletic ability.

"The Committee favored non-participation of a transfer student

in a sport in which he had represented his former institution. It also expressed the opinion that college athletic organizations should meet squarely and deal effectively with the whole question of students who participate in summer baseball and other sports on a professional basis, and also represent their college as amateurs. The Committee feels that the present situation constitutes an evil in that many colleges make no attempt to treat this problem, and many others which have rules on the subject do not enforce their rulings."

Report on the Choice and Methods of Teachers.—Recommended:

"(1) That at each college and university an undergraduate study be made of the advisability of adopting and if favorable of the method of adoption of some form of tutorial system as practiced at Oxford University.

"(2) That the N. S. F. A. commend the services and sane steps which are now being made by the students of certain colleges and universities toward criticizing objectively their courses and instructors, and do all in its power to extend the practice to all student bodies.

"(3) That at each college and university an undergraduate study be made of the general quality of instructors as teachers and as scholars; and that in the case of finding any prevalent deficiency the true cause of the deficiency be sought and suggestions be made for its correction.

"(4) That the N. S. F. A. obtain statistical reports from the students of every college and university regarding specific instances and general policies wherein the freedom of the teachers is suppressed, and that it attempt to find out the cause of this evil and offer suggestions for its correction.

"(5) That the question of the relation of the salaries of athletic coaches to those of teachers be investigated in a similar way, with special regard to suggestions for the improvement of intellectual activities."

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION.—The Twenty-First Annual Report of the President reviews the work of the year and gives the usual statistics. The number of allowances and pensions now in force has increased from 736 to 779. The general average of retiring allowances is slightly over \$1600; the total load of allowances and pensions in associated institutions has increased from \$1,104,578 to \$1,197,653; for non-associated institutions it has decreased from \$80,095 to \$79,057.

During the year twenty-six universities, colleges and research

institutions, and endowed schools reported their adoption of the contractual plan of retiring allowances, making a total of one hundred and fifty-eight which have adopted the annuity contract. Teachers in 400 other institutions have taken contracts without the assistance of the institutions with which they are connected.

Part IV of the Report deals with various aspects of legal and dental education; The Quality of the Educational Process in the United States and in Europe; Part V with Pension Systems and Pension Legislation.

PENSIONS AND INSURANCE.¹—"There is one matter in connection with this question which I think ought to be brought to the attention of younger men—those who are twenty or thirty years from retirement. The Carnegie Foundation will spend on the retiring allowances of those in the associated institutions, during the next thirty years, approximately fifty millions of dollars. Its rules are based on the salaries during the last ten years of service. In fact it seemed impossible to devise a retiring allowance system that would not have some relation to the amount of the salary. In the last dozen years, the salaries in the associated colleges and universities have doubled and, conceivably, may increase further. Retiring allowances, therefore, even if kept at a constant level do not have the same relation to the final salary. It would seem to me, therefore, in the interest of younger men who are fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five years away from retirement, to call their attention to the opportunity to take out annuity policies to supplement their own allowances from the Foundation. Small annual payments for this group of men would make a notable addition to the retiring allowances.

"The annuity business of the Association has grown more rapidly than the insurance business. A teacher can buy almost any kind of insurance policy from the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association that he may desire, at a lower cost than he can buy it from a commercial company, but it is still possible for the commercial companies, through their agents on the spot, to sell their policies to many who fail to realize that they are paying from eighteen to twenty-five per cent of the money that they invest in overhead costs.

"There is another fact which many teachers overlook. They take out an annuity contract with the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association and place their insurance with a commercial company,

¹ Extracts from letter of President Pritchett, to W. W. Cook, Chairman of Committee on Pensions and Insurance.

not realizing that in the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association the profits in insurance will all go to the policyholder under his contract, but when he buys his insurance in a commercial company he is handing over for the purposes of overhead and agents' fees a large share of the profits which would come to him in his own company.

"The Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association, by incorporating in the form in which it has, escapes taxation and is able to conserve all its earnings for ultimate distribution to the policyholders, but it cannot send out agents in states other than New York or compete with the commercial companies in the matter of solicitation on the spot. Under these circumstances it is encouraging that so large an amount of insurance has been written, but we are constantly confronted by a situation under which a teacher after taking out his annuity policy with the Insurance and Annuity Association, where the commercial company cannot compete, gives the profitable side of his business to a commercial company, thereby devoting a considerable part of his payments to overhead which would ultimately come to his own profit had he placed his life insurance in the Association."

DOCTORATES IN SCIENCES.—The National Research Council *Bulletin*, Number 75, contains a list of doctorates conferred in the sciences by American universities during 1925 and 1926, numbering 740—an increase of 109 over the preceding year and nearly double the number in 1917. Chicago leads with 78, followed by Wisconsin with 53, Johns Hopkins 50, etc. By far the largest numbers were in Chemistry (256), followed by Physics (76), Botany (67), Psychology (60), etc. The number of institutions represented in the list is 48. Titles of theses are given.

EARLY BULLETINS DESIRED.—The Secretary's office will be glad to purchase at fifty cents each copies of the following issues of the *Bulletin*: April, 1916 (Part I and II); November, 1916; January, 1917; February, 1917; March, 1917; April, 1917; January, 1918; April, 1918; February, and March, 1920.

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

THE DETERMINATION OF FITNESS FOR COLLEGE.¹—"There is a large class of boys and girls of college age who have not yet found themselves, and who do not find themselves until late. They have no definite purpose; they do not know for what they are fitted or what they are aiming at, and yet they are capable, if once roused, of doing something well worth while. . . One of the great tragedies of life is the case of the man of good powers who might have accomplished something, and who fails of that accomplishment because he had been denied the opportunity, or because he did not wake up to his possibilities until too late.

"There is another class, made up of those of mediocre abilities, but who have a determination and a power of work that may carry them far. The longer I live, the more firmly I am convinced that many of those who have achieved the greatest eminence and the greatest success in various lines are not men of outstanding intellect and ability but men of moderate powers, who have achieved success chiefly by their industry and their persistence. To refuse the opportunity of development to one who has that power and who has in him the possibility of attaining something worth while, because he is slow or because his I. Q. is low, will mean the sacrifice of some extremely able men. On the other hand, it is a tragedy when one who might have been a success in what we call a lower walk of life is lured by a false ambition into becoming a failure or a mere drudge in something that, according to the academic idea, is a higher sphere. . . What we have to do is to select the most promising from among those who have brains but have not yet been aroused, and those less gifted in brain power but who possess the moral qualities that count for so much in achieving success. . .

"At this point I register an emphatic protest against each of two opposing theories. One is that an intellectual aristocracy should be created by restricting college education to those of the highest mental endowment. To do this would shut out a great number capable of distinctly successful achievement and able to contribute to the welfare of the world. The other theory is that the college doors should open to practically every one who desires it, whatever his qualification and his training. Very recently it has been strongly urged in public that instead of restricting their numbers, our colleges should strain their capacity to the limit, and that new institutions should

¹ An address before the Harvard Teachers' Association, March, 1927.

be opened to accommodate every boy and girl who desires a higher education. To do this would mean the cheapening and spreading thin of our college education, and, still worse, would mean the luring away from worthy and successful careers of many who would be doomed to virtual failure. . .

"For measuring these qualities there are four kinds of tests, four distinct criteria, available, and the practical question is to decide as to the value and reliability of each of these criteria. The first criterion is the school record, and, in the judgment of many, this is the only reliable criterion and the only basis of selection that should be considered. I dissent emphatically from this view. . .

"There are several classes of schools good records in which do not necessarily show fitness for college work. The first of these is the well organized high school, in which the great proportion of the pupils are going no further and in which there are many whose heredity and home environment are distinctly unfavorable. The second includes the large class of schools in smaller places, often doing work well adapted to their local needs, but frequently handicapped by inadequate teaching force and insufficient equipment. The third group includes the schools, increasing steadily in number, whose work is based on theories of education that have not yet been fully tested, or at least are not yet accepted by the educational world. I am not attacking the so-called progressive schools. I frankly cannot accept many of the theories on which they are based, and it seems to me that in many cases what they gain in freedom, spontaneity, interest, harmony with environment, and preparation for complete living—whatever those phrases mean—is at least partially compensated for by loss of self-control, of concentration, of persistence, of accuracy and of thoroughness. Their spirit is excellent, and experimentation often leads to progress, but they are still in the experimental stage and their results are not yet proved. Until they are proved, records in these experimental schools are of little value by themselves; they must be supported by other evidence. Then, there are the great number of schools, public and private, that do not come up to a decent standard. In spite, however, of these exceptions, the record of a good student in a good school is about as satisfactory a piece of evidence as can be found. . . But as the only criterion, they are, in the present condition of our schools, lamentably unreliable.

"The second criterion is the examination—practically, at this time, the College Board examination. To some minds an examination as

a test of fitness for college entrance is anathema. Here again I take square ground against a widespread opinion. An examination is not a perfect test, but it is something well worth while in itself, and properly constructed and administered it is a valuable and generally a fairly adequate test. One of the great advantages of having the College Board hold the examinations for the country, instead of each college setting its own examination, is that every single examination that is set is the target for criticism. The results are known, the paper is published, and all criticisms or suggestions for improvement are directed at one central spot.

"An examination by itself is not an adequate test of fitness for future work, but when to the record of a full school course there is added a reasonable examination, you have two things which, taken together, give a fairly adequate test of fitness. . . .

"If the charge is made that preparation for examinations limits freedom of teaching, I retort that this is more than compensated by their influence in enforcing standards of accuracy and thoroughness. The weakest point in American schools is their superficiality and sloppiness, and the College Board examinations are today our most effective instrument in enforcing standards and checking the vagaries and laxity to which many teachers are prone. . . .

"The third criterion has been less fully tested and its value is less firmly established. It is a comparatively new thing as used for the determination of fitness for entrance to college. I refer to the Scholastic Aptitude tests now coming so generally into use. . . .

"The report of these tests is not sent to the candidate or to his parents. He is not allowed to know what his Intelligence, or Scholastic Aptitude, rating is. The report is sent only to the college that the candidate wishes to enter, and it is made out in a way which will give the college the utmost possible knowledge. Each report gives the general score of the student on the whole battery of tests, and a letter mark—A, B, C, or D—showing whether the rating actually received is to be regarded as excellent, fair, or unsatisfactory. In addition, a percentile mark is given, showing where a candidate would rate in a group of a hundred. Then, there is given the actual score made by the candidate in each of the sub-tests, so that it is possible to get some indication of the power of a candidate in a particular line. If, for example, a student was rated low in arithmetic, and high in language, this might afford an explanation of why his College Board records were low in mathematics and high in language. . . .

"These three criteria, taken together, supply a fairly accurate means of judging the fitness of candidates, and, in many cases, an adequate means. Often, however, human judgment must be called in to estimate the relative value of discordant results, and the lower we go in the scale, the more closely we approach the border line cases, the more this human judgment becomes necessary. And so I name as the fourth criterion the sympathetic insight and the sanctified common sense of the men and women who have to make the final decision that may determine the earthly destiny of the ambitious boy or girl.

"There is no escaping the responsibility. School records, examinations and the Scholastic Aptitude tests are valuable instruments. But it is little short of criminal to treat these mechanically and to make the future of an individual depend solely on a numerical rating. Success in college and life depends on intangible values as well as on measurable attainments. No instrument has yet been devised to take the place of human judgment, and, fallible as this judgment is, it must be the final interpreter of results and must make the final decision in a doubtful case. It is a tremendous responsibility but it is the glory of our teaching profession that we do so much to shape the destiny of our pupils. We dare not evade the responsibility that goes with our opportunity and our power."

WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy.

YOUTH OF TODAY.¹—"I know that this new generation will support and maintain every social force that makes for tolerance in religion, for freedom of thinking, freedom of teaching, for peaceable discussion of differences, for the unity of all people of good impulses in the work that needs to be done for mankind.

"The chief agency which American youth will use to promote the higher unconscious unity of souls will be the fine arts. No generation of young America before you has shown greater devotion to the cultivation of music, literature, architecture, painting, the drama. Every one of you will at least make of himself a competent appreciator. However he may win his daily bread, he will learn to love the finest things of life. In the presence of artistic perfection all vexations of the day, all conflicts, vanish. We merge as one soul in our admiration of perfection. We achieve there our highest welfare.

"But it is in schools and education that we must find the daily fulfilment of our watchword. Each attempt to limit and narrow the

¹ Address to candidates for degrees, Ohio State University.

purposes of the school as an institution in American life has served only to make clearer than before the broad idea of welfare on which public education must now be conceived. Universities have discovered many theories on which to justify themselves, all of them true, many of them partial.

"The highest theory and the one to which universities will ultimately come in spite of their present reverence for marks, ranks, and degrees, is the ideal of education for well-being, education for its own sake, for satisfaction of the love of learning as a good in itself. The founder of Cornell University expressed the desire to establish an institution to which any man might come to learn anything. Schools of arts have cherished the study of art as its own excuse for being. In all of our reorganizing and subdividing with narrower ends in view we must not lose sight of learning for learning's sake. Immediate practicality will be wholesomely modified and routine will disappear if education is spiritualized by a genuine enthusiasm for it. That enthusiasm appears as often among the younger students as among the older. It is the saving grace of the graduate student and the freshman alike. Nothing short of the enthusiasm for learning as a good in itself will explain the multifarious and varied forms of state education in university and public school today. As in the realm of legislation and government the emphasis has shifted and the chief question no longer is what precedent will permit, but what human well-being requires.

"Furthermore, no one will admit that these enormous state enterprises in higher education are conducted primarily for the few who are gifted with rare genius. The people would agree that those few, as fast as they are discovered, should be endowed, set apart, privileged in all respects, and provided with the highest means for developing their gifts to the full. But this does not necessitate any denial of opportunity for the great majority who constitute the strength of working America. We Americans are glad to call ourselves the common people, but we do not regard ourselves or our children as uncommonly common. That there are marked differences in abilities has always been known and acted upon in schools but not until our tests are perfected and command general assent can they be properly regarded as final. To employ them for the purpose of classification is right. To employ them for the purpose of exclusion will hardly be admitted as American doctrine.

"The schools and the colleges have been charged with undertaking

new projects in education without good reason for it. We sometimes overlook the fact, however, that there have been vast changes in home life and the organization of business, compelling new undertakings in education. No childish desire for change has dictated these new things. Manual training and domestic science and business training appeared in American schools only after the home life and the farm life and business organization had ceased to provide their equivalent, and were so altered that they could not function educationally as they formerly had done. Many ancillary considerations enter in—the failure of the apprentice system, the changed status of women, the desire for a more scientific treatment of occupations that once it was assumed might be well enough learned casually and by imitation. Schools and colleges have acted in view of very obvious needs.

"It may be that the principle of welfare will help the colleges and universities to solve the problem presented by the numerous extra-curricular activities. Looking at the waste of time and effort involved in many of them we note that in this respect they compare favorably with cooperative organization in the world at large. There is plenty of wasted effort in Congress, in business organization, in the classroom. A visitor from Mars might easily come to the conclusion that the multifarious social groups on this planet are engaged in a competition to see which may waste the largest portion of its time most busily and most pleasantly. He would certainly not give the prize for waste to the college youth. He would observe that the athletic organization has worked out a technique that largely eliminated waste. It is completely efficient for its own purposes. A man of honesty and common sense recalling the way in which time was pleasantly wasted in college a generation ago could not fail to declare that time is wasted today in much better ways. He could not fail to note that the tendencies of most college activities today are educational. Would time be better utilized if the extra activities were abolished?

"When all of the modern machinery of life has been brought to perfection shall we then at last be ready to live with satisfaction to ourselves and as blessings to our neighbors? Not unless our schools and colleges and universities shall have kept alive in the hearts of men and women the love of generous living itself, the things of the mind and of the soul, the joy of music and poetry, the aspiration of hope and faith and religion."

J. V. DENNEY, Ohio State University,
Ohio State Lantern, March 18, 1927.

WHAT SHOULD A BOY WHO IS GOING INTO BUSINESS GET OUT OF COLLEGE?—"Boys should get the attitude of mind that they should do whatever job they have set for them. That does not mean that it will be the most pleasant job; of course it doesn't. And that is a very hard thing to get into their heads, that they should do a disagreeable job. Most of us would rather go on a week's cruise or a week's golfing but than stick to our jobs, but we do stick to our jobs. . .

"The second thing that it seems to me a boy should get out of college is certain resources of high types of enjoyment that he can fall back on after he leaves college—in his leisure times, in times of illness, in times towards old age when he looks forward to retirement; and particularly a group of interests of a high type that he can communicate to his own children. I am speaking as a parent tonight, and most of you are, I imagine, taking the attitude of parents.

"The college is uniquely the place in which to acquire these resources. In the first place, in the preparatory schools boys cannot be expected to get them to a highly developed degree, because they are not open to them; the college throws wide a lot of new windows. In the preparatory schools a boy's time and energy are chiefly given to such things as reading and writing, composition, languages, the essentials of mathematics, in other words, those things which he has to get if he is going on in life at all; whereas in college all sorts of alluring intellectual prospects, that he can get specifically only there, are spread before him. Nor, without foundations laid in college, is he likely afterwards to acquire a competent familiarity with the interests of which I speak.

"Another point is the rôle that maturity plays. If a boy gets swerved away into business as soon as he leaves the preparatory school, it seems to me that he has not the maturity of judgment that will prevent him from becoming pretty well narrowed down to his business; the mere fact of four years of greater maturity counts tremendously so far as stability of his acquired interests is concerned.

"The next thing that I think we parents should consider very seriously is that a boy in college should certainly get the opportunity for a mature and independent choice as to what sort of business or career he wants to go into. His mind should be liberated. I have had case after case of boys coming to me at Yale whose fathers, either wittingly or unwittingly, have exerted undue pressure in deciding

on what the boy is to do both in and after college; perhaps through a tremendous ambition that he should go into his father's own business, or that he should go into a certain profession that his father has for some reason taken a liking to. . .

"So, one of the great things that a boy should get out of college is the opportunity for mature and independent choices.

"Perhaps one of the most unique assets that college can give to a future business man is the intellectualization of his activities and decisions. At college a boy has four years of such detachment from practical affairs as he will never have again. He exercises his brain on a great variety of subjects, developing all sides of it, and acquires a many-sided capacity to attack problems. The college boy has real genius in analyzing and arguing about general ideas. His analyses, too, are disinterested—because of his detachment. He has no practical axe to grind; a professional school student, or a man in business, if he takes up some subject of study—say psychology—does so, I have found, in order to exploit it for some immediate practical interest. He is thereby checked from envisaging the subject entire—its methods, its many-angled implications. Not so the free, keen undergraduate. Whatever ideas he gets excited about he ransacks thoroughly—and for their own sake. He gets a habit of perspective. This is what I mean by intellectualizing one's activities, a most precious asset in later attacks on pressing practical problems which, because of their urgency, often distort perspective. I am not sure that this is not what is meant by the vague phrase 'mental training'. . .

"Last year some 300 business firms sent representatives to Yale to interview seniors, with offerings of some 600 different jobs. In other words, the business men are coming to the colleges to find their future executives. This run of the business men at Yale has increased fourfold since the War. They say that the men they want for their future executives now go to college. . .

"What do the business men who come to Yale say as to why they come to the colleges for their men? These, of course, are impressions. I have not any statistics here, but I think the impressions are well worth thinking about. A friend of mine, a very prominent executive in New York City, said to me in regard to his own son, giving the reasons why he wanted him to go to college, 'I could give that boy an excellent job in the A. T. & T. I could probably promote him at the end of a year. But there would be a time when he would come

in competition with men of his own intelligence level who had had the additional advantage of a college education. And beyond that I could not help him; he would suffer.' The important phrase in his argument was, 'with men of his own intelligence level;' for the brightest will succeed anyway; the dull ones will lag; it is among peers that the 'additional advantage of a college education' tells. Many business men have testified to the soundness of my friend's arguments.

"Secondly, these business men have said to us, 'We want boys who have developed from their college training a restless curiosity, a critical attitude toward themselves and toward their jobs, a certain complex intellectual initiative.' They have said, furthermore, that on the whole they think that those boys who have devoted a large part of their attention to what these business men call the speculative or argumentative subjects are better prepared for the business world than those who have devoted themselves more or less to subjects that are capable of being answered 'right' or 'wrong,' such as the exacter sciences, the mathematics, and some of the technical subjects. The reason they give for this is that boys who have had the more speculative and more argumentative subjects are accustomed to look at the question from all sides. They are accustomed to criticize anybody's statements and, therefore, they get an attitude of mind that gives them intellectual initiative and that critical curiosity which seems to be so valuable.

"Here is a related point often made. The business men seem to prefer the ones, in short, who have taken a general course, rather than those who have taken a purely technical course. The boys who have taken a purely technical course are more likely, these men think, to feel that they have the equipment to go right into business, and, consequently, do not develop that curiosity, that restless thinking, querying, and criticism of their jobs that the other boys are likely to develop.

"A very careful survey made of the student body at Yale by means of a questionnaire indicated that even many boys who entered the Scientific School went for a general rather than a technical education, so that it is not only in a liberal arts college that one may get the type of general education that I speak of; many scientific schools are attending more to the more general fundamentals, that will prepare the boys to acquire later, in business, the technical equipment needed—and acquire it rapidly. One should not, of course,

belittle the exacter technical training; its value is tremendous, but it should not bulk too large in the general perspective."

ROSSELL P. ANGIER,
Harvard Alumni Bulletin.

THE DOOM OF THE ARTS COLLEGE.—"The Arts College is doomed. We can see it in decay, as compared with its pristine status in our educational system, and we can note it encompassed about with an ever increasing cloud of enemies, conscious and unconscious, malicious and innocent, but all equally deadly. . .

"Two of the greatest professions of modern society, therefore, law and medicine, have virtually decided that a liberal education in the original Arts College sense, cannot be made a prerequisite to entrance upon the more technical professional curriculum and have thereby practically eliminated from the rank of prospective bachelors of arts two of the very groups which society can least afford to have lacking in the essentials of a liberal education. . .

"When we turn to engineering, the situation is even more desperate. The thousands upon thousands of students in our engineering schools are admitted from secondary schools and shot through a technical, crowded curriculum that leaves no time for 'liberal' courses and no thought for culture. Moreover, with their overemphasis on technical proficiency, and frank disdain for 'useless' subjects and those who pursue them, the engineering students, like the students in law and medicine, contribute to the development of the prevalent inferiority complex under which the true Arts College student is likely to labor in our great universities, especially our great state universities, today. . .

"I am viewing the position of the Arts College primarily as it exists, or attempts to exist, in the state universities of the Middle West and the West. For whatever we may think of the relative merits of privately endowed universities and of state institutions, I am confident that we are definitely committed to the idea of making our state universities the equal of the best in every field. The typical American university of the future is certain to be the state university, not the privately endowed institution, just as the typical secondary school of today is the public high school and not the private academy which was supreme fifty years ago.

"So, when I discuss the place and future of the Arts College in our state universities, I am getting at the very heart of the problem.

The influence of the privately endowed institutions is steadily diminishing in comparison with that of the state institutions, and whatever solution is finally worked out by our state universities will necessarily determine the ultimate outcome in the great private institutions as well. . . .

"It is out of this original college of arts that practically all of the later colleges in our state universities have come, and that is almost equally true, of course, of all universities public or private, which have added professional colleges other than law, medicine, or engineering. The subjects that are the basis of these professional courses started almost without exception as courses in the colleges of arts. . . .

"What, then, are some of these monstrous children that are smothering their academic mother, or rather starving her to death by gobbling up all the nourishment in the shape of students, upon which she would normally prosper? A complete enumeration is almost impossible, for while we are talking, almost, a new one may spring into being. But I can give you a sample list by picking up the catalogue of any great state university almost at random. In addition to agriculture, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, law, and engineering, we find graduate colleges, colleges of business administration or commerce, colleges of fine arts, colleges of education, colleges of journalism, etc. . . . The multiplication of these separate colleges, with their special degrees and their claims to special fitness for directing post-high-school activities of students, could not but end disastrously for the Arts College. . . .

"While the professional schools are warping the Arts Colleges from the top, and the trade schools are twisting it and pulling it hither and yon on all sides, another danger is approaching it from below. This danger, of course, is the junior college.

"The junior college is sweeping the land like a conflagration, and there is a great deal to be said both for and against it as a new development in our educational system. I have no space here to enter into a discussion of the more general aspects of that phenomenon. I would simply point out, however, that if the junior college program is carried out to its logical conclusion, our boys and girls will go to high school at home for two additional years and then to the universities, if at all, as juniors. The junior college should, in the minds of a great many educators mark the end of their general education, and they should immediately plunge into professional work, the

assumption being, I presume, that ultimately all professional work in the universities will be built upon the completion of junior college work. That would inevitably mean the extinction of the Arts College...

"Is this trend, then, even if not desirable, really inevitable, as the title chosen for this article would imply? It seems so. And yet, if the conviction I have expressed as to the essential value of the ideals of the Arts College is sound, and if the thoughtful leaders of opinion in educational circles will fearlessly champion it, the case may well not be hopeless. Let our professional schools be organized on the basis of a four-year liberal college course as a prerequisite, and let our present trade schools be transformed into professional schools with a similar prerequisite. Then the arts course would have a real dignity and significance. Then even the student who is not yet settled as to his life calling, but desires to become an educated man in the best sense, could attend four years of college without suffering under an inferiority complex. Then the four years of college would offer something which no junior college, conceived merely as an extension of the present high school course, could even dream of duplicating. We should have fewer college graduates, no doubt, but who will deny that they would be better? Or that the crying need of American education today is not more university graduates but better ones?"

HERMAN G. JAMES, University of Nebraska,
New Republic, No. 654.

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE.—"At the present time we have about as many engineers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, preachers and other professionally trained men as the community needs and will support adequately..."

"The agricultural schools educate the boys away from the farm and make chemists, business men and educators of them. Colleges of commerce are interested in making big business men only and send the ablest men from the rural and small town districts to the metropolis. The girl who is preparing for teaching in the grades is induced to finish her college course and will rarely teach in the grades. Splendid opportunities these are for these people, and nothing should be done to curtail them for any one who is qualified to profit for the good of himself and for the country. But here is the obverse side: if higher education shall limit itself to this aspect, it will create a top-heavy aristocracy which will bring about cutthroat competition and a con-

sequent moral, political, and social crisis. Of this we have not yet had any marked evidence; because we are only approaching the peak of stable equilibrium between supply and demand for men in learned careers. The point I want to make is that there may be a serious danger ahead for the intellectual aristocracy of the country; it may lead to something like the present condition of the intelligentsia of Europe.

"But the college-educated men and women constitute a very small fraction of any normal community. If we are interested in education for democracy, our point of attack must fall at a different level from that of the most favored, namely, the *intelligent middle class of the population*. Upon this class the present tendency in higher education is reacting most unfavorably... Farm labor is looked down upon as menial, tenant occupation is spreading fast, and there is a very rapid deterioration of the country population, which is, after all, the backbone of the human energies of the nation. This may cease to be if the farmer is to be replaced by chemists in the production of synthetic foods. But the same trend is seen in every occupation of what we may call the middle class in all parts of the country!—'My son and my daughter shall have the highest education possible and shall not labor as I have done in the struggle for existence.' Fine, right! But where does the education for democracy come in—the more than 95 per cent of the people who will not profit by a full college education? Which of our institutions of higher learning have any interest in that problem?...

"The increase of high-school education throughout the country has been most gratifying... This is education for democracy, of which we may justly be proud.

"But, presto! at the close of the high school there comes a radical change in educational theory. It is now no longer education for democracy, but for aristocracy. I am using education for democracy here in the sense of education for the welfare of the people as a whole, and education for aristocracy in the sense of education for a privileged class. The implication is not that one is right and the other is wrong; the higher education of a superior class is absolutely essential to democracy, but with it there must go a fair program of continuity reaching all levels of society, as intimated above. The principle applied, in so far as circumstances permit, should mean education for every American in proportion to his capacity to profit thereby personally and give adequate returns in service.

"A great inconsistency or violation of this rule is represented by the absence of a two-year unit at the lower level of college. An analysis of the needs of the community would unquestionably reveal that, on the basis of merit and demand, the community would need from two to five times as many people educated at a two-year college level as at a four-year level. . .

"The situation in commerce today is typical. If the middle-class business man's son wants to get something better than a high-school training for business, he is confronted with the situation 'four years, no more and no less.' . . . What he wants to do and learn, and what the community needs in the majority of cases, is a dignified practical course which will fit him not only for the conduct of his business, but for a self-respecting and intelligent citizenship at his natural level of employment.

"Let us see what types of organization, based upon standard college entrance requirements, are likely to serve the most general vocational needs of the community in *two-year courses at the collegiate level*.

I. Arts and Science.

"...The junior academic curricula will be built up as finishing courses. Each curriculum will be an integrated whole so that whichever one of these four groups the student elects, he will find a curriculum fairly prescribed with subject-matter integrated into large units, such as five-hour courses throughout the year, and all organized and presented with the distinct understanding that this two-year course is to give the student the best possible introduction to practical life through this amount of liberal training. The main object of these junior academic curricula will be preparation for intelligent citizenship. History, for example, will not be chopped up, into technical small units, but there will be one five-hour course presenting in bold outline the development of civilization not only from the historical, but from the economic, social, ethical, and esthetic points of view. Biology will not be split up into zoology and botany, but there will be one five-hour course in biology, treating the subject distinctly with the recognition that the subject is not studied as a tool for higher technical training, but as a general orientation for the understanding and appreciation of daily life. The same general type of treatment will be accorded the subject-matter in each of the other groups. . .

II. *Technological or Semi-Vocational Courses.*

"...As samples of courses in this group we may mention the following:

"(1) *The Normal Training Institute.* This institute will correspond in scope and function to the two-year normal school of the best type, with the specific function of training teachers for the primary and elementary grades in the public schools. This level of teacher preparation is the most neglected. The normal schools have deserted their original function for the purpose of becoming colleges, and something must be done to replace them. Those which have become teachers' colleges and have thereby thrown the two-year certificate into disgraceful shadow, must reorganize so as to give the two-year course a dignified status. But Iowa, for example, has one recognized normal training course in the 'Teachers' College, while more than two hundred *high schools* offer normal training courses of a *secondary* level. This high-school education is not adequate preparation for elementary teaching. We must provide junior college facilities which will raise this level of instruction for those who are now limited to high-school facilities...

"(2) *The Business Institute.* The old-fashioned business college, which was of secondary school level, served a wholesome purpose in the community, but it went out of fashion because the high schools took over the job. But at the present time there is a greater demand for a brief business course at the collegiate level than there was at the high school level a generation ago, and this should be met...

"This business institute may well have as one distinctive unit a secretarial course in which English is the backbone, stenography and typing are required, and such things as bookkeeping, reference work, filing, and editing are taught in addition to the liberal subjects.

"(3) *The Institute of Applied Science.* In institutes of mechanic arts about half of the subjects will be uniform for all, and there will be certain subjects designed as preparation for work in specific fields, such as carpentry, plumbing, electrical work, automotive work, foremanship in specific industries, building contracting, city management, industrial personnel work; in short, all the various occupations in the community in which we desire to have skilled workmen who have enough of the theory of their work with fundamental training for skill and a cultural setting which will make them skilled workmen and self-respecting citizens. Hampton Institute, for the

colored people of the South, is a splendid example of this type of institution.

"(4) *The Institute of Home Economics.* A course in the arts of home-keeping, not for the preparation of teachers or specialists, but purely a home training in the school in which vital interests, such as child welfare, heredity and eugenics, will play an important rôle...

"(5) *The Musical Institute.* This will organize a large part of what is now private instruction in the city under well-trained and certified musicians for elementary instruction in music and those academic subjects which should go with a musical education. Much of what is now given as private individual instruction will be organized into group instruction to good economy... This institute will be a civic center around which the musical activities of the city will organize and cooperate, because the opportunity for hearing good music and participating in performance is essential to good training; and unless music reaches into the home and the homes of friends, it is not music.

"(6) *The Institute of Art.* This will dovetail with community art interests and furnish opportunity for training in graphic and plastic arts, both pure and applied, together with such academic subjects as are essential in art education. It will, of course, serve as the art center of the community and will influence not only the home life but the civic life—the buildings, decorations, and pleasures of the city...

"The problem of transfer is one of the distinctive features in the plan here proposed. It is contemplated that two types of two-year institutions—the academic and the technological—will be organized on a common basis into one state-wide or nation-wide system, whereby educational standards may be upheld and each may serve as a dragnet to gather in students who may to advantage transfer to another junior college, or at the end of the junior course transfer from one educational plan to another...

"One of the fundamental reasons for separating the junior college from the senior college in the four-year course is to differentiate the methods of the two units. In the junior college the highest art of teaching should be brought to bear. This may be contrasted with freedom and encouragement of initiative in the senior college. These two years should be a massive survey of the fields covered, particularly with the aim of showing relationship of fields of knowledge and fundamental principles, giving the student the information which is necessary for an independent point of view and later exercise of initiative...

"The time has come for a nation-wide recognition of this deep gap in our educational organization and to provide for a natural stopping place at the end of two years of college training, giving for this a junior degree or certificate which will gradually acquire a recognized status. The community will finally come to appreciate the larger opportunities for higher education of the middle classes, the reasonableness of this provision, and the wisdom of giving this junior degree a status in occupations for which it trains. J.C.G. (Junior College Graduate) might be a suitable degree.

"These junior colleges will draw a considerable number of those who are now in the standard colleges and often for very good reasons; but the main body of junior college constituency will come from those classes of the community or those types of students that are not now represented in college. It will really be a new type of student body of a distinctly American origin and character...

"Where the junior college is an extension of the public school system in a city, it is essential that the plant and staff shall be bodily separated from the high school, because at the end of the high school course the pupils are at the stage at which they need a radical break or fresh start in the way of motivation and application. They need specifically to get away from their high school associates and activities and enter upon what will seem to them a dignified and serious arena. Public junior colleges should certainly not be located in cities or areas with a population of less than seventy-five thousand.

"The importance of the break between high school and college is thoroughly recognized in America. It furnishes a dignified, natural finishing place for large numbers of students and an opportunity for a radical change of environment, associates, methods of study, and motivation for those who proceed to the college level. In like manner the plan here proposed provides a happy terminal station for many and a convenient transfer station for those who proceed into the higher levels. The advantages are pedagogical, economical, and social."

CARL E. SEASHORE, University of Iowa,
School and Society, No. 643.

RESEARCH.¹—"Because of its illusiveness, because of the enormous prizes it has brought to mankind, because of its value as a mental training, there is a tendency to be slipshod in criticizing research. Research is such an honest effort to achieve something of value that

¹ Presented at a joint meeting of the Rhode Island Sections of the American Chemical Society and the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists.

we are apt to condone the futility because of the good intention, or we may err the other way and condemn what is intangible because we can not measure its use...

"A destructive criticism is easy. On the constructive side I suggest that research problems can only be chosen by men who have a research instinct; by men who are following up a lead which may mean a real advance in our knowledge. Such men are rare and therefore my first change would be in limiting the number of academic institutions in which research is done for advanced degrees. This calls for a great unselfishness, while I am afraid that inevitably selfishness is characteristic of the attitude of the academic body to its students, perhaps unconscious, but arising out of the situation. Thus if a senior has shown great promise it is natural for the graduate school to try to keep him when it should send him to another university where he will find the man best able to lead him on in the lines which he has chosen.

"In furthering this improvement I should like to see the undergraduates acquire some critical faculty of their own, just as they do in Europe. This, I believe, can be brought about only by getting away from the idea that the university is merely a finishing up of an ordinary education and by adopting the European belief that it is a great advantage to move from one university to another, which can be done there without loss of effort. In that way the student encounters different presentations of the same subject, and he learns to acquire a certain discrimination which seems totally lacking in the student's attitude to research in this country. When it comes time for him to do his doctor's work, he should be quite clear in his mind that such and such a university, because of the research ability of the professor in charge of a single branch, is the only place in the country for him to go. Since he can work his way about as easily in one place as another, there seems no reason why we should not be able to foster this procedure...

"I should like to see a definite stand taken against the point of view that because a conscientious young instructor has been promoted on account of his teaching ability to an assistant professorship, he is therefore entitled to experiment on graduate students. Unless the young man has, by his own work, established the intrinsic merit of his attitude to research and his capacity for initiating research, he should not be allowed to act without the advice and direction of a maturer research man. On the other hand, it should be recognized

much more quickly than is often the case when the young man is a more brilliant research man than the head of the department, and then the head of the department should be honest enough to turn over his best students to the assistant professor.

"From my experience of industry and of academic research, I do not believe it possible for a man to function at the same time both as an executive of a large establishment, as a teacher, and as a director of research. I do not believe it can be done, except by a great sacrifice of the highest attribute of the man, that most delicately balanced function of the mind which is the guiding spirit of research. Therefore, I should like to reiterate what has been said so often, both by myself and others, that we should not reward research by executive responsibility and that we should relieve the true research man from the round of ordinary teaching and let him build up a research school fed by students from the country wide, sent by his colleagues and the well-informed opinion of the student body. . .

"In substance, then, my criticism of academic research is that it fails of being what it should, because the subjects chosen are not well selected, the time spent is out of all proportion to the results, and the effort is not sufficiently coordinate.

"My criticism I want to be taken as constructive, because I am, in reality, thoroughly in accord with the belief that academic research is fundamental to the success of the race. It is on this account that I am glad to think that owing to the realization by those directly engaged in industry of the importance of the work done by their own research men, we shall see eventually a very great encouragement of basic research by men of wealth. . ."

R. E. ROSE, *Science*, No. 1701.

OZONE IN THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE.—"For a number of years I have been talking with college and university men about the value of research in colleges, chiefly research by faculty members. In general there has been instant approval, but some have expressed the feeling that the job of the college is teaching and that it can afford to be rather indifferent toward research. Possibly a word as to the personal experiences which impressed me with the importance of the research attitude among college teachers may not be out of place and may help some who are indifferent to the idea to give it sympathetic consideration as something which grows naturally out of experience in college life. . .

"In the year 1908 I began teaching at an institution I had long known. Proud of the college, of her record, and of the record of her graduates, it was only natural to ponder over the problem of how best she might grow still stronger. After a thoughtful survey of this problem several things stood out distinctly.

"I arranged to increase the number of teachers in the zoological department and to limit the students to such a number as we could properly care for without unreasonable overwork. This naturally suggested limitation of numbers in the whole college in the interest of better teaching. It was, therefore, a great pleasure to me when some years later the college, assured of a generous increase in endowment, voted to limit those received into the freshman class to such a number as would give about one thousand in the college proper, exclusive of the graduate departments and the school of music.

"The college not infrequently lost good men from her faculty. The reasons for their leaving seemed likely to give suggestion as to further possible strengthening of the college. Inquiry developed two chief reasons which were about equally influential, low salaries and teaching burden so great as to hinder the teacher's growth as a scholar in his field of study. The financial reason applied to all teachers alike; the consideration of growth in their scholarship appealed more strongly to the more valuable men and thus tended to have a peculiarly unfortunate selective effect.

"Fortunately, when a generous increase in endowment made it possible, salaries were substantially increased. But as yet the too great teaching burden, though lessened, has not, I think, been sufficiently relieved. Instead of bringing in numerous instructors at low salary to help distribute the teaching load, the college took a step which seems at first thought to be away from lightening the burden of teaching. They voted that it should be the policy of the college to have more full professors than professors of other grades, and to have more assistant professors than instructors. There were in 1926 in the college faculty forty-one full professors, eleven associate professors, sixteen assistant professors and fourteen instructors, not including gymnasium floor directors. Instead of lessening the teaching burden by securing numerous teachers without the most thorough training, she chose to emphasize adequate training for her teachers. Her teaching load per teacher, though not so high as in most colleges, could, I think, advantageously be lightened, if she wishes to be able to get and retain her pick of the qualified men as new men are needed.

"A third point which seemed to me to appear from some years of observation of the faculty and their work was a matter of judgment and might be disputed by some of my colleagues, but it impressed me more and more as the years passed. The most inspiring teachers, those under whom the subject of study most gripped their students, seemed to be those who themselves had an attitude of productive scholarship, a spirit of research. . .

"It is largely these personal observations which led me to desire to promote research among college faculty members so that their spirit of productive scholarship may quicken and revivify the intellectual atmosphere of the American college. The thing of real importance, the thing more fundamental than all others, is the character, ability and productive scholarship of its teachers, if the American college is to reach its highest attainment in inspiration to life of most vital quality, not life founded on conformity to tradition but life infused with the spirit of independent search for knowledge of the realities in the midst of which we live and of loyalty to our growing conception of truth.

"The comparative isolation of the college may be a disadvantage. Most colleges, not a part of a university, are located in towns or small cities where the faculty member meets few persons interested in his special line of study. It is difficult to build much of a fire from one or two logs. Many men who could be kindled into quite a flame, if in a considerable group, haven't the inner fire to glow with much brilliance when isolated. Indeed many grow altogether cold. The effects of this partial isolation can be somewhat overcome. Regional associations in intellectual pursuits might well prove a stimulus. Intercollegiate athletic relations are developed, also intercollegiate contests in debate and oratory. Cooperative relation in scholarly matters might also to advantage be developed. State academies and regional associations might well give faculty members stimulating scholarly contacts. Cooperation between colleges, especially between neighboring colleges, might be developed in several ways to the advantage of both faculties, giving wider contacts to both. Exchange of teachers for addresses or lecture courses or for longer periods would benefit both the receiving and the lending college. A man rounding up a fine piece of work or finishing a good book might well give to more than one institution the stimulus of his fresh enthusiasm. Also men from abroad or from a distance could by cooperation be secured by several colleges while one alone might

be unable to bear the expense. Such wider contacts are a stimulus to faculty, students, and community. It seems very strange that such intercollegiate cooperation has not been far more developed. It has great possibilities far beyond the items here mentioned...

"But it is not enough to have M.A. work by research methods going on in the college. Much of the undergraduate work should be conducted as semi-research, putting a problem up to the student and leaving him semi-independent in its solution. Much of the advanced work, especially in the 'major subject,' should be of this sort. And some work of this type should come for each student early in his course, in his freshman year. One good piece of semi-independent problem work early in the college course will go far to tone up all the student's work throughout the whole course, helping to substitute a productive spirit for one merely receptive.

"Practically all the work in the college should be presented by the teachers from the standpoint of growth in knowledge and growth in appreciation of truth..."

M. M. METCALF, Johns Hopkins University,
School and Society, No. 646.

CHEMICAL RESEARCH.—"In the discussion of my major theme a few comments on the preparation of the investigator and the training for chemical research may not be out of place. Among the criticisms to which the academic world is now-a-days being subjected one hears frequently the charge that memory training plays a rôle too exclusively. The late Sir James Mackenzie, an eminent physician familiar with the experimental method, supported the complaint in words that his biographer has described as 'the only "revenge" which Mackenzie ever permitted himself against the educational system by and through which he had suffered.' With his own experiences in mind he wrote:

"There are two very distinct qualities of the human mind: memory, and the power of reasoning. The earliest to be developed is that of memorizing, and this can be cultivated with great ease. The power of reasoning is quite different, although, no doubt, memory takes a part. When we look at a great number of students, we discover that this power of memory is greatly developed in a few, and all our educational methods are devoted to its cultivation. Examinations are specially contrived for the purpose of discriminating those with the best memories, and to them all the honors and prizes are given.

"The individuals who, on the contrary, possess more of the power of reasoning than their fellows, receive no consideration. There are minds which have a difficulty in remembering isolated facts, but if these facts are related in some consecutive manner, they can not only remember them, but also appreciate their bearing on one another. But this type of mind is slow in acquiring knowledge, and in our present-day methods of education less and less encouragement is given to this type of student. His peculiar powers are never developed, and their presence is never suspected.

"The outcome of the teaching of today is to hail the student with superior powers of memorizing as the brilliant student, and the one with the great future. The consequence is that his path from the outset is made easy for him. Bursaries and scholarships fall to his share, and before he has acquired any experience, he is appointed to a teaching post. In the absence of any knowledge acquired from the results of his own observations, he is forced to teach that which he was himself taught, and, as he can not discriminate between truth and superstition, he hands both on to his students. As years pass he comes to believe what he has taught is true and may even grow impervious to new ideas which are contrary to the beliefs he has been expounding.'

"A reaction against the type of education that Mackenzie thus assailed has asserted itself through the widespread introduction of the so-called 'laboratory method' of teaching in which the student is being left more and more to his own devices. This is the essence of the inductive method. It promotes keenness of observation and critical judgment; it presupposes the open mind. As so often happens with our enthusiasm for the new, the inductive method has been driven in some places beyond its greatest effectiveness. Freedom to start on a voyage of discovery in the student laboratory does not invariably lead to the desired shores. The ways of the pioneer discoverers have usually been long, and their progress slow. After all, there are facts, multitudes of facts, long since described, which could be rediscovered by each generation of students if this laborious process seemed worth while. Why require it?

"Without a background of facts thinking becomes a difficult, if not a futile, task. A rich store of fundamental facts is the indispensable equipment of what Pasteur so expressively termed the 'prepared mind.' Many persons are privileged to make chance observations; only the prepared mind profits by them. 'Curiosity

alone,' Bigger has written, 'will not make more than a laboratory dabbler, a dilettante of science. Many other qualities must be added to make a worthy researcher. Knowledge, both wide and deep, of his subject and of related sciences is needed to fit him for his work and to help him to surmount the difficulties with which the paths of science are so liberally sprinkled.' Didactic instruction, so largely discredited at the present time, may yet regain some measure of favor as an economical procedure for ascertaining essential facts. The test tube and the reagent bottle are not the alpha and omega of a chemist's training.

"Waste of time is not more tolerable in student days than in after life. The candidate for a career in research should be spared from wasting time in useless laboratory work. Peabody recently remarked that 'the popular conception of a scientist as a man who works in a laboratory and who uses instruments of precision is as inaccurate as it is superficial, for a scientist is known, not by his technical processes, but by his intellectual processes; and the essence of the scientific method of thought is that it proceeds in an orderly manner toward the establishment of a truth.' "

L. B. MENDEL, Yale, *Science*, No. 1693.

SEGREGATION ON THE BASIS OF ABILITY.—"There have been numerous discussions as to what one ought to gain by segregating students. The writer had not been able to find any discussion or report, however, on exactly what any one had gained, nor the extent of that gain. The attempt was, therefore, made to determine whether anything can be gained in the teaching, for example, of such a subject as descriptive geometry, which seemed to be the best test medium; and if so, what, and how much. Since students had been mixed indiscriminately during previous years, sufficient data were available to furnish all necessary information with reference to the benefits derived by students in such a course when the high, average and low are placed in the same sections. Approximately fifteen students were then drawn from the top for a high section, and from the bottom another fifteen for the low section. Those between were divided into sections of approximately fifteen each. On the second test, it seemed necessary to be somewhat more severe and arbitrary; only those whose general average was three or more were placed in the high sections and in the low sections those whose average was 1.5 or less. This seems a better plan and possibly one could with

profit be even more severe. Under the latter plan, approximately 20 per cent of the total are placed in the top sections and another 20 per cent in the bottom. *Perhaps this is the place to make a comment, which will be repeated with further details, that very probably the bottom 20 per cent might have been barred from entering college to the profit of all concerned, including themselves.*

"Before proceeding to a discussion of the characteristics of the high and low men, as learned from observation and contact with them in college, it might be well to cover a point that certainly will be raised with reference to the amount of outside work which these high and low students do to support themselves in college. There is a tendency to believe that many poor students are such because they are devoting too much time to various kinds of labor to earn their room, board, or money to pay their expenses. The data which were collected concerning the activities of all these students indicate that $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the low students did no outside work at all, and $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the high students had no extra employment. Sixteen per cent of the low students had regular work during school time, while 21 per cent of the high students were doing regular work during school time. Fourteen per cent of the low students were doing irregular work—that is, odd jobs—during school time, and 11 per cent of the high. Apparently, no conclusions can be drawn from these except possibly that employment on miscellaneous work about the college or in town to earn room, board, or money has no noticeable effect on the work of what we term our high and low students. If they are making poor records it is not because they are working; and if they are making high records it is not because they are not working outside.

"To sum up the history and qualities of the low students, then, a large percentage of them are the grandsons of American-born men and women; the sons of fairly well-educated parents; they had made relatively poor general records in their preparatory school; had done indifferently in mathematics, physics, and chemistry; made poor records on reduced loads of work during both semesters in college; and from careful observation they were found to possess low ratings in several of the subdivisions of intelligence and one or more of the important subdivisions of inclination.

"The reactions of the instructors on their work with the high students were practically the same as those of the writer concerning the small group of high-grade juniors and seniors in mechanism. The

writer has since had the opportunity to teach a high section in the test subject. There was no noticeable expenditure of energy to overcome friction. These students were so eager to proceed, so keen in their perceptions, so high in their powers of analysis and correlation, so tenacious of purpose and capable of sustained mental effort that the instructor served as a *guiding* rather than as a *driving* agent. The instructors found that it was necessary for them to maintain an unusually high pace to satisfy such students, and they invariably finished a session delighted and exhilarated in contrast with the exhaustion and depression on finishing with the other groups. The high students are able to finish the exercises designed for the average students in approximately two-thirds of the time required by the average.

"In the course of these experiments the pace has not yet been increased to a point which the high men have not been able to follow. By this, it is meant that the pace has gradually been increased, but from a desire to avoid a serious blunder the limit has not yet been reached. It has been determined that the superior students can finish, even with an expenditure of only two-thirds of the time required daily by the others, the total semester's course as designed for average pupils in about eleven weeks. This provides the opportunity of carrying such students farther in the subject and, at the same time, the opportunity of giving them more difficult and more interesting exercises that will consume the full amount of time that they should spend in the classroom. . .

"The conclusion that is most important is that all sections which were rated as superior on the basis of their first semester accomplishments showed themselves superior in their accomplishments in this subject. It is interesting, likewise, that all sections which were rated as inferior on a basis of their accomplishments on all first semester subjects, except possibly one, performed in this same order in the second semester. The section which is rated as 14 in the low group is the one which the writer taught and on which he deliberately expended unusual labor in an attempt to find out how much energy one must devote to such a class to make them apparently know the subject. No instructor can be expected to labor with such a group as he did in that experiment. Their final rating did not truly represent them.

"The seeming conclusion, then, is that this relatively easy method of rating students on the basis of grades received on their previous college work to determine whether they should be put in the high or

low group, is satisfactory. Such grades truly represent the important items of preparation, intelligence, and inclination.

"The general conclusions from the experiment and attendant investigations are:

"(1) That superior pupils in at least technical subjects and probably in all subjects can derive an additional profit of 33 per cent when segregated.

"(2) That the relatively easy method of segregating pupils on the basis of their previous college accomplishments is satisfactory, because such grades seem to give an accurate measure of the students' preparation, intelligence, and inclination.

"(3) That approximately 20 per cent of our total freshman class in engineering may be classed as superior and 20 per cent as inferior.

"(4) That a large percentage of the inferior pupils can easily be detected by their poor accomplishments in their preparatory school.

"(5) That there is no apparent harm done to the student in college by segregating him with his mental equals.

"(6) That an undue amount of energy of the instructor is consumed by the low students in a class of mixed students. The high students do not by any means get sufficient of his attention."

H. W. MILLER, University of Michigan, *School and Society*, No. 656.

TIME, TECHNOLOGY AND THE CREATIVE SPIRIT IN POLITICAL SCIENCE.¹—"With respect to creative work in this relation we carry on our backs a heavy burden of acquired rights and servitudes. In the United States political science has too long been a household drudge for lawyers—political lawyers at that. In a large measure, the printed subject matter of our discipline—at all events the part most easily accumulated and exploited—is composed of statutes, ordinances, decrees, and judicial decisions—often shadowy reflections of the stern realities of life. Now of all brain workers, except perhaps the bureaucrats, the lawyer is the closest slave of precedent. Of necessity this is so, for were he to cut loose from set patterns, the lawyer would be lost, with what effect upon justice as distinguished from judicial determination, I shall not venture to say. At all events, while time and technology ever stream forward, the lawyer is always looking backward to see what his predecessors said and did. Even when he finds it necessary under the stress of novel contingen-

¹ Presidential address delivered before the American Political Science Association.

cies to reverse himself the lawyer must twist his new emotions to fit the rhetorical mould of some historic symbols.

"The second great incubus carried by political science, making the business of creative thinking difficult, is the baggage provided by the professional historian. Even more intently than the lawyer, and with less personal interest in the pulsating substance of life, the historian looks backward. However great his services in the preservation of national memorials, the historian makes few weighty contributions to political science. In mortal fright lest he should be wrong about something, he shrinks from any interpretation—from the task of seeking any clue to what William James called the big, buzzing, booming confusion of this universe. . .

"Besides the impediments which lawyers and historians have thrown in the way of connecting political science with the flowing stream of time and technology, the circumstances of academic life in America have not made for venturesome explorations, with their terrible risks of error, ridicule, and futility. Though time and technology are remorseless, as Matthew Arnold said of thought, sapping institutions and resting on that which is eternal, colleges and universities are essentially conservative. Our supervising trustees are business men to whom orders for goods in hand and in sight and the next dividend date are realities more vivid than the onrushing stream of years that devour us all, or they are political appointees, living or moribund, no less poignantly concerned about the day's grist.

"Given these invincible circumstances, college presidents, when searching for funds to sustain their institutions, must move respectfully among business men and transitory politicians. Hence for all executives of the higher learning 'safety first' is the most effective battle slogan—safety first with reference to the instant need of things, not the long view. And a college professor who is disloyal to the complex that supports him is supposed to be lacking in the qualities of a gentleman—and in a sense is wanting in those very characteristics.

"Then to this general environment of circumspection are added several academic usages detrimental to creative thinking. First of all is the weight of teaching hours—the absence of generous economic support for political science. In natural science there are many research professorships practically freed from classroom routine and well supplied with huge buildings and laboratories; but to the professor of political science we assign from eight to twenty hours

teaching a week and money enough to buy a few dog-eared textbooks. It does not appear in the records that any college or university in the country gives its instructors in government either the leisure or the money necessary to travel and observe political institutions at work in all parts of the earth. Finally, we seldom promote a lively young instructor to a position of comfort and financial ease until he has crippled his mind by writing textbooks acceptable to the president and trustees or has grown so old that the fiery hopes of youth out of which the future is made have died down into the dull embers of reminiscence.

"The fourth great menace to creative thought in America today is research as generally praised and patronized, the peril of substituting monocular inquiries for venturesome judgments, the peril of narrowing the vision while accumulating information. Research in detailed problems with reference to specific practical ends no doubt produces significant results—findings of the highest value to practitioners, and are to be commended and supported more generously than ever; but still with respect to large matters of policy and insight there are dangers in overemphasis.

"In the first place, by making success in some minute and unimportant academic study the gateway of admission to the profession, we admit to our fellowship students with no claims whatever to capacity for independent thought, venturesome exploration, or stimulating speculation. In the second place, research under scientific formulas in things mathematically measurable or logically describable leaves untouched a vast array of driving social forces for which such words as conviction, faith, hope, loyalty, and destiny are pale symbols—yielding to the analysis of no systematist. In the third place, too much stress on the inductive method of minute research discourages the use of that equally necessary method—the deductive and imaginative process which often makes the poet or artist a better fore-teller and statesman than the logical master of detail and common sense...

"If my thesis is right, namely, that time and technology move relentlessly upon all mankind and all institutions, and my antithesis is correct, namely, that the conditions pertinent to creative thought in American academic life run against, not with, the constructive imagination necessary for any harmonious adjustment of humanity to its destiny, then we may well say: What is the upshot?...

"First of all, it seems to me that the intellectual climate in which

we work can be profoundly altered by the very recognition of its factors. For example, if, instead of abusing college trustees and presidents we frankly invite them to take note of their operating defence mechanisms, we may do more to change the spirit of the academic world than by preaching heavy sermons on the logic of academic freedom. No doubt a little whole-souled laughter, even when conferring honorary degrees, would help loosen up the mental lattice work through which we peer.

"Then we might learn something pertinent by a study of the factors that have entered into the personality of each great thinker in our field. By common consent, are not Aristotle, Machiavelli, and the authors of *The Federalist* giants? Though some would admit other philosophers to this formidable group, none will deny to these a place of pre-eminence. And the significant thing in relation to the present argument is that every one of these creative workers acquired his knowledge and insight not only through books, but also through first-hand contact with government as a going concern. In any case, none of them wrote with an eye on a committee of the trustees on salaries, promotions, and pensions. In the course of observant experience supplemented by historical inquiry they all penetrated to the substance of politics; and it may well be doubted whether, apart from contributions to administrative and operating detail, there has been any substantial addition to the body of principles enunciated by these formidable forerunners.

"From cognate sciences also we may learn something of advantage to us in the quest for the methods of more creative thinking. No small part of our intellectual sterility, as already indicated, may be attributed to the intense specialization that has accompanied over-emphasis in research. Certainly nothing is truer than Buckle's profound generalization to the effect that the philosophy of any science is not at its center but on its periphery where it impinges upon all other sciences. If we could early insert that devastating concept into the minds of our callow young novitiates, we should do more to breach their intellectual hobbles than by requiring at their hands ten years' research on the statute of mortmain or the derivative features of Rousseau's political philosophy." Particularly can we fertilize political science by a closer affiliation with the economists who now seem to have cast off their Manchester dogmas and laid their minds alongside the changing processes of production and distribution.

"Finally, what hope lies anywhere save in the widest freedom to inquire and expound—always with respect to the rights and opinions of others? As my friend, James Harvey Robinson, once remarked, the conservative who imagines that things will never change is always wrong; the radical is nearly always wrong, too, but he does incur some slight risk of being right in his guess as to the direction of evolution. It is in silence, denial, evasion, and suppression that danger really lies, not in open and free analysis and discussion. Surely if any political lesson is taught by the marvelous history of English-speaking peoples it is this. And yet everywhere there seems to be a fear of reliance upon that ancient device so gloriously celebrated by John Milton three hundred years ago—the device of unlimited inquiry. Let us put aside resolutely that great fright, tenderly and without malice, daring to be wrong in something important rather than right in some meticulous banality, fearing no evil while the mind is free to search, imagine, and conclude, inviting our country men to try other instruments than coercion and suppression in the effort to meet destiny with triumph, genially suspecting that no creed yet calendared in the annals of politics mirrors the doomful possibilities of infinity."

CHARLES A. BEARD.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS AS A SOCIAL STUDY.—"A social study is one that provides experiences in social enterprises and in learning the inter-relationships of people in maintaining life activities. The purpose of a social study includes the development of habits of cooperation and attitudes favorable to wholesome and efficient cooperation. . .

"History, geography, and civics—the *Trivium* usually presented as including the social studies—do comprehend many questions relating to the problems of cooperation in securing and distributing economic supplies and in procuring justice among men in their production and use. But the content of these subjects or of a study resulting from their fusion is not related to the actual economic and ethical problems of the daily life of people directly or immediately, but rather indirectly or remotely. There is a gap between the participating realities of daily life and the more or less abstracted questions presented to learners for consideration. The more remote problems do not grow out of an understanding of conditions that are immediate and vitally important to the learner. There is lacking that sense of interest, personal relationship, and connection which is needed to

give the contributions which may be made from geography, history, and civics the directness of contact with personal conduct making for actual control in thought and action. As long as the materials and problems studied by the learner are outside of the experiences in which he himself participates, the probability is very great that their study will influence but little the form or the quality of those activities in which he does participate. On this basis, the study is academic in the invidious sense...for true learning, there should come those experiences and investigations which relate to immediate problems of supply, selection, cost, use, and conservation of materials and products found in one's home and community. From this study as a foundation of meaningful experiences emerge most of the questions for which we may have to go to geography, history, or civics for answers. Then such questions become real rather than merely hypothetical. Here is where industrial arts has its place in finding first the health, economic, appreciative, and social facts and problems of individual, home, and community life relative to the use and production of material supplies. This forms an intelligent basis for the questions leading out to the less immediate problems of the larger social life. It is from the industrial-social life of daily experience that the questions and problems emerge leading to history, geography, and civics as helps in interpreting their wider social relationships.

"To one thinking of industrial arts as the old-time manual training or hand work, the point of view here presented will seem meaningless, and justly so. But industrial arts is to-day, in the better schools, a study of the industries for the values that such studies have in the pursuit and interpretation of daily life. Work with materials and tools is for the sake of clarifying ideas and cultivating attitudes and appreciations of values relative to the use, distribution, and production of industrial supplies. The hand work is not for the development of skill as an end. That is left to specialized vocational education for those whose occupations require specific skills. The hand work needed as a means of developing understanding and attitudes and as a means of satisfying the constructive impulses of learners is entirely adequate to develop that general dexterity and control appropriate for normal physical growth and general life participation.

"Social science, as hitherto developed, has centered about what are called 'problems of contemporary life.' How many of these

problems, as usually selected, are those of the contemporary life of either children or adults in their own homes and communities, in their daily social contacts and experiences? Too much of the work as organized under this inclusive term assumes a basis of knowledge and organized experience which children simply do not have. Many of the questions are of such difficulty that even the most critical, scholarly, and advanced thinkers differ materially in their proposed solutions. More emphasis upon the actual social activities in which one is virtually compelled to participate in his own home and community would certainly make for a more efficient social life than ignoring these and giving all the attention to questions of national and international character. Not that the latter type of problems should be omitted, but that the questions which most vitally touch upon the learner's own social problems and immediate social relationships and responsibilities should come first, is the plea that is made. In industrial arts as now organized in its most pragmatic forms, with its rich thought content as well as its cooperative opportunities for constructive, investigative, and art forms of participation, lies a means of social education of the first order.

"The social studies *Trivium*—history, geography, and civics—should expand itself into a *Quadrivium* by adding industrial arts as representative of the basic social activities, more vital to immediate social participation than many of the questions of the other three fields or of any fusion of them into one."

FREDERICK G. BONSER, Columbia University,
School and Society, No. 650.

CONFESSIONS OF A COLLEGE DEAN.—"I am a dean—a dean of men in a medium-sized American college.

"Do you know what a dean is? Most people, I find, don't. Some are disposed, apparently, to regard the office with a certain awe; others, quite unmistakably, incline to contempt; but in either case they have little conception what it is they are respecting or despising. I must, therefore, explain before I begin confessing.

"A dean has ordinarily two aspects, which may be called the ideal and the practical. Ideally considered, he is a guide-philosopher-and-friend for the young men under his charge, the person to whom they bring their troubles of every kind—scholastic, financial, amatory, and moral—for wise counsel and guidance. It is assumed that he shall be a man of wide experience, mellow wisdom, and youthful

heart, to whom young men will freely unbosom, and who will understand, as father would (or should, though he sometimes doesn't). Undoubtedly this is the conception every college seeks to maintain.

"But, actually, no college in these days lets its dean be such a counselor, except incidentally and almost unofficially. Practically he is a policeman. He must spend substantially all his time promulgating, and, so far as possible, enforcing, the multifarious rules and regulations which the faculty are constantly enacting. Among the things which it is the dean's business to make the students do are the following:

"1. To spend, spasmodically at least, a certain minimum of time in study.

"2. To attend classes. (In this case, and with respect also to items 3-5, there is, of course, no thought of 100 per cent regularity; there is ordinarily a liberal allowance of 'cuts,' or permitted absences; but as the student approaches this limit the dean must warn him, and, if he oversteps it, must penalize him.)

"3. To attend chapel.

"4. To participate in military drill.

"5. To take regular physical exercise.

"6. To be vaccinated.

"7. To refrain from gross cheating in (a) final examinations, (b) mid-semester quizzes, (c) laboratory exercises, and (d) themes, theses, and other written work prepared outside the classroom.

"8. To refrain from getting drunk, at least in public.

"9. To refrain from smoking in the college buildings.

"10. To keep hazing and class scraps within such bounds that actual loss of life or limb will not occur frequently.

"11. To omit from the college 'comic' magazine jokes or pictures of such undisguised indecency as would render the publication unavailable under U. S. postal regulations.

"12. To close college dances at some specified hour prior to day-break.

"13. To have at least nominal chaperons present at such dances.

"14. To pay their bills to the college and the local merchants.

"15. To refrain from writing checks with no balance in the bank; also from forgery.

"16. To refrain from using automobiles except under certain narrow restrictions.

"17. To keep off the grass.

"Surely, things have come to a pretty pass with the higher learning, when the central office on every campus, to which recourse is taken in every possible connection, is a police office; when it has become axiomatic that 'students' must be *compelled*: (a) to give some slight attention to the business of learning, and (b) to refrain from all manner of childish misdemeanors.

"There has, of course, come to be some dispute as to what the purpose of the college is or should be; but the long-time sense of the community still holds, I believe, that that purpose is predominantly intellectual—that it centers, in some way, about studies. If this be so, then the only valid reason why a young man or woman should go to such an institution is a self-felt desire for knowledge and for the intellectual and moral development which accompanies, or tends to accompany, the acquisition of knowledge.

"Is such the motivation of the 800,000 students now in residence in the colleges of this country? Let us not be unduly cynical. For a considerable number it is. But for the majority we may take our answer from college fiction, in which studies figure only as an incidental bore and learned professors as butts of ridicule...

"What would the college naturally do, confronted with this situation? I am not asking, as yet, what it ought to have done (and still ought to do); that is another question. But what *would* it do? What would any of us have done in a similar contingency?

"Obviously it would try compulsion. These crowds of youngsters had been admitted as 'students,' and college was traditionally a place for study. Therefore these new 'students,' like others, *must* study and *must* go to classes. It appeared they did not care for these things, had never thought of caring for them; they had not 'come for knowledge.' No matter, 'students' they were, and they must at least go through the motions...

"It must not be forgotten, even in our cynical and satiric moods, that, among the 800,000 there are some few thousands of young men and women who are genuinely interested in learning and unobtrusively apply themselves to it. They are almost completely submerged and lost sight of amid the noisy 'collegiate' turmoil surrounding them, but they are there—though a dean seldom encounters them in the flesh. Why should he encounter them? They don't need a dean; and he is kept busy rounding up the others...

"I must confess that when occasionally I snatch a moment from my arduous routine and allow myself to question what it is all about,

I am somewhat appalled at the pitiable futility of the whole business. There is not—cannot be—any real use in forcing any person to study. The word itself originally implied desire and zeal; and any one who has ever really learned anything knows that nothing can be really learned in any other mood. And if this be so, as it unescapably is, then I and my fellow deans, in so successfully compelling the non-students—*i. e.*, the non-desirous—to go through the motions of desiring and pursuing learning, are doing harm rather than good in the institutions and society in which we labor so diligently. Specifically, we by our mighty efforts are merely enabling the colleges to retain in their membership vast numbers of youngsters who ought, for their own good and that of the colleges, to be summarily sent away.”

The New Republic, No. 655.

THE ABSENTEE PROFESSOR.—“How does a professor on leave of absence from his college spend his time?

“According to tradition, he goes to a large library, preferably abroad, and spends many hours every day delving into dusty, and often musty, old volumes, pursuing a word or an idea down the centuries and across continents. He searches and searches—yea, verily, he researches. If he is successful in his quest, he publishes a book or at least an article at the end of the year.

“At this point the writer is moved to ask the reader whether he thinks it would be heresy to hint at the existence of a professor who is as much interested in his students as he is in his subject. Some professors have been known to really enjoy studying some of the big problems of educational policy. In so doing they have, of course, trespassed on the territory claimed by deans and other administrative officers as theirs. The writer, who is one of these bold persons, has been trying for years to understand why the continuity of the pupil's education should be so rudely broken at the end of the twelfth school year—when he passes from high school to college.

“In the midst of these puzzling problems, the writer received an invitation to teach for a year in a co-educational public high school in a large industrial city and at the same time to do research work on the curriculum. As the writer happens to be a mathematician, there was another important aspect of such an experiment, for, although many studies have been made of the teaching of mathematics in the elementary school and in the junior high school, but scant attention has been given to the senior high school questions.

The teaching of demonstrative plane geometry is one of the most baffling of the problems which are yet to be solved. So the writer, with a background of many years' experience in teaching solid geometry, trigonometry, analytic geometry, descriptive geometry, and calculus to students in a college for women, is now on leave of absence teaching plane geometry to boys and girls and at the same time doing research work on the senior high school curriculum. Incidentally, a technique for teaching plane geometry is being worked out and a text is being prepared which is to be tried out in mimeograph form in the classroom.

"There is no thought of recommending this type of sabbatical year to all college professors. But, if the professor is also a teacher and if he possesses the adaptability that will enable him to fit quickly and easily into new surroundings, and if he has a definite problem that involves both high school and college, then the writer would strongly recommend to him this non-traditional method of spending a leave of absence."

E. B. COWLEY, *School and Society*, No. 646.

COLLEGE ATHLETICS: AN OPINION.¹—"So far as our present topic is concerned, the whole trouble harks back to the fact that modern education is based upon a school system created by men who were quite honestly committed to the neo-platonic theory that the souls of men must be saved at the expense of their bodies; a theory which is still implicit in the formal beliefs of almost all Christian churches. . .

"Thus, to our own day, the educational institutions of the Latin countries, though most directly descended from Greek and Roman originals, make no provision for physical education in the modern sense; the sporadic attention given traditionally to fencing and equitation was clearly inspired by military rather than pedagogical considerations.

"Some of the more northern countries have done better than this, but even here the same modern program, so clearly indicated by Rabelais four hundred years ago, has had hard sledding. Perhaps we Americans plume ourselves on being ultra-modern. Well, any middle-aged American citizen can reconstruct the entire history of college athletics in the United States from his own memory. He will recall the intolerable boredom of the gymnasium drill that alone was

¹ Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges in lieu of a report from the Commission on College Athletics. Dean Nollen was Acting Chairman of the Commission.

dignified by the name 'physical culture' in our colleges only a generation ago. He will remember the rude beginnings of football, both Association and Rugby, and of other games, and will testify that these sports were long outside the pale of academic interest; that college administrators and instructors regarded them as negligible vagaries of the very young, and as certainly unrelated to any of their grave responsibilities as educators of youth. He will tell you that long after students and alumni had developed a sports program of absorbing interest to themselves and to the public, academic pundits ignored this development and held with stupid insistence to a regimen of so-called physical training that was demonstrably out of harmony with the psychology, particularly of American youth, and that the said pundits were capable of obstinate objection to the acceptance for credit in physical training of such interlopers as football, basketball, and track, in substitution for the meaningless grind of the gymnasium...

"Let us be honest. To the simon-pure academic mind, athletic sports, and similar activities which students find attractive, are still best described in President Wilson's phrase as side-shows. Do not we pundits have constantly on our tongues the horrible word 'extra-curricular?' Evidence enough that we are still mediævally-minded, that we still hug to our scholastic bosoms the fond delusion that we can do something for the minds of boys and girls while leaving their bodies and their social relations and their most absorbing interests on the other side of the fence.

"It might, perhaps, have been otherwise. If we can imagine a forward-looking academic policy, we may play with the thought of college administrators welcoming athletic games for their great educational values, and incorporating them into the academic program. This would have meant, from the first, providing sufficient facilities and competent direction so that the entire student body might have had access to these new values. Among other things it would have meant the systematic training of leaders in this branch of education, with a zeal comparable to the assiduity actually devoted to the propagation of the cabalistic symbols Ph.D. It would surely have meant enormously greater efficiency in the education of our youth...

"It was said before this Association last year that the cure for the evils of athletics is more athletics, or athletics for a larger number. I believe it is equally true that the cure for the evils of professionalism in college athletics is more professionalism. The trouble is not that coaches are too professional; they are not professional enough...

"When we succeed in producing a breed of physical directors who are first-class educational experts, who would count it malpractice to turn out a student with an over-strained heart, who would scorn to seek victory by sharp practice, who are eager to fit their special work into the general academic program, then the athletic millennium will be measurably nearer. Perhaps by that time the coach and the community will look upon an intercollegiate contest as a fair trial of strength and skill between two well-trained teams, rather than a contest of wits between two rival coaches pulling the strings from the bench for a lot of puppets. Can one imagine an honorable professor sending in helpful suggestions to his students from the side-lines while they are passing a competitive examination? Perhaps, latest of wonders, the day will finally dawn when the Association of University Professors will send its heavy artillery into action to defend the academic tenure of an athletic director who loses his job solely because his team has made a disappointing showing in the percentage column.

"In a larger sense, what is needed to save our colleges from the dry-rot that threatens them is a resolute campaign of extermination against the monstrous concept 'extra-curricular.' If the college of liberal arts has any function at all, apart from furnishing agreeable club facilities for the children of the rich, it is the function of organizing the scattered material of our complex civilization into some sort of unity, and thus giving meaning and direction to the lives of the rising generation. The college cannot begin to contemplate this essential service without a practical recognition, on its own part, of the unity of life."

JOHN S. NOLLEN, Grinnell College,
Bulletin Association of American Colleges, Vol. XIII, No. 3.

OBJECTIVES FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE SPORT.—"A questionnaire study of the educational and administrative objectives for intercollegiate athletics has been made by a committee consisting of Professors J. F. Williams, of Teachers College, Columbia University (chairman); Curry Hicks, of the Massachusetts Agricultural College; C. W. Savage, of Oberlin College, and J. W. Wilce, of Ohio State University. The results of the study are given below.

Administrative Objectives Ranked by 413 Judges.

"1. Coaches to be members of the faculty, with a seat in the same, assigned usually to physical education, on full-year basis, teaching not necessarily to be limited to physical education.

"2. Control of athletics to be vested in president, faculty, alumni, and students, with the latter two in minority, under the rules effective for other departments of college activity. Schedule of games, number of contests, and other items to be approved by the director of athletics.

"3. Intercollegiate athletics to be run by a budget plan, like any other department of the college, funds being controlled by appropriate college officials. This should lead to a deflation of the cost of athletics to the students and public, and in the outfitting of teams.

"4. Allow no intercollegiate freshman games. In place of these subterfuges for varsity participation, hold a series of freshman-sophomore weekly games and contests. Where possible, have several teams, and award championship upon a percentage rating.

"5. Publication by the president of the college in his annual report of the number and kind of scholarships given to students.

"6. Allow varsity participation in the major sports, football, baseball, basketball, track, and cross-country, for two years only (junior and senior years). None of the values of intercollegiate sport is lost by this measure, and all the values can be retained and made available for more men. If the results are good for a few men, they should be extended to as many men as possible."

School and Society, No. 650.

INCIDENCE OF PENSION PAYMENTS.—"...What conclusions, now, may be fairly drawn from the foregoing analysis?

"(1) We have seen that while economic analysis seems to indicate the shifting of the burden of pensions to the pensioners there are possible forces working both to resist and to accentuate this process. But it is probable that over the field as a whole, allowing for all sorts of people, some cautious, some speculative, some ignorant, some informed, and so on, those forces making for resistance and those making for accentuation of shifting would largely counteract each other. The net influence either way might well be very small. If so, the common economic opinion seems to be upheld, that in the long run owing to changes in the supply the cost of pensions under any plan tends to be shifted to the shoulders of the pensioners themselves.

"(2) On the other hand, as the time required for this process may be long, perhaps a generation, present teachers gain by any institutional contribution to pension payments. They would there-

fore be wise to advocate joint payment plans, since throughout the entire transition period which for some may be their whole teaching life, they enjoy an increment, though a constantly diminishing increment, of wages.

"(3) It is probable, owing to the different type of persons employed, that pension payments are shifted more slowly and less completely in professional than in academic schools. It might therefore be particularly advisable for the faculties of professional schools to insist on joint payments, or if possible on 100 per cent institutional payments as being to a considerable extent a permanent gain.

"(4) The small pension payments and the still smaller payments made for insurance, especially group insurance, can not readily be shifted and will largely be borne by the institution. The cost may, however, be made up for them by the increased efficiency of their staffs.

"(5) There is, however, a real danger that even small pensions may be shifted to the beneficiary unless there is a greater knowledge than is commonly shown of the present value of pensions and insurance. If this ignorance is unavoidable faculties should be urged to favor plans based upon fixed annual payments.

"(6) Finally, if pensioners pay for their pensions they earn them, and hence some current practices are undoubtedly wrong. It is wrong to base pensions on vague promises or on unsound non-actuarial calculations. If pensioners are paying for pensions they should be certain of getting them. They should be contractual and based on proper actuarial foundations. It is equally wrong to withhold accumulated institutional contributions for any reason whatever. These payments have been earned, they are part of wages; they can not rightfully be taken away, even though the institutions gain thereby."

J. A. ESTEV, Purdue University, *School and Society*, No. 642.

REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

HISTORICAL STATEMENT

On March 16th, 1927, Professor Louis R. Gottschalk, Assistant Professor of History, wrote to Professor H. W. Tyler, Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, requesting that an investigation be made of the circumstances attending the dismissal of Professor Rolf Johannesen. On March 17th, Professor Johannesen was reinstated in his position by the Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville. On March 17th, the Board accepted the resignation of Professor Gottschalk, but coupled with its acceptance a dismissal from the classroom for the remainder of the academic year and a statement to the effect that Professor Gottschalk was so dismissed from his classes because he was the sole or principal cause of trouble at the University. On March 19th, the Board made a public statement to this effect. On April 4th, the Board sent to Professor Gottschalk a resolution of the Board in these terms, namely, "that Dr. Gottschalk be invited to make a statement in writing making any complaint or grievance he may have to the action of the Board accepting his resignation of March 17th, 1927, and that his reply should be in the hands of the secretary of the Board on or before April 8th." On April 13th, the secretary of the Board of Trustees wrote a letter to Professor Gottschalk containing a resolution of the Board of Trustees dated April 7th, namely, "that we stand by and decline to rescind our action upon the resignation of Dr. Gottschalk on March 17th, 1927, and that we withdraw so much of our published statement of March 19th, 1927, as was to the effect that he was the sole or principal cause of trouble in the University of Louisville."

At the request of President W. T. Semple of the A. A. U. P., Professor S. E. Leland, of the University of Kentucky, visited Louisville and made a preliminary report on May 12th, which was submitted to the Council in condensed form. The Council approved the appointment of a committee to investigate the so-called Gottschalk case and general conditions at the University of Louisville.

President Semple appointed a committee to conduct a general inquiry into conditions at the University of Louisville. The committee was composed of the following three members, Arthur C. Cole, Ohio State University, Columbus; Otto Heller, Washington University, St. Louis; and R. K. Hack, University of Cincinnati,

Chairman. From June 12th through the 16th, the committee was constantly engaged in interviews with members of the Board of Trustees, the President of the University, some of the Deans and members of the Faculty of the University, and with prominent citizens of Louisville.

The University of Louisville is a municipal institution largely supported by local taxation. It has five faculties: the Faculty of Liberal Arts; the Faculty of the Speed Scientific School; the Faculty of the Medical School; the Faculty of the Dental School; the Faculty of the Law School. Its governing board consists of the President and ten Trustees.

In June, 1926, A. Y. Ford, President of the University, died, and the Board of Trustees, in July, 1926, elected George Colvin President of the University. Shortly after, Chancellor Patterson was made Chancellor Emeritus. In the College of Liberal Arts there were approximately 800 students and 47 members of the Faculty, seven of whom are part time. The University had in 1923 begun to grow with considerable rapidity and it had recently moved from its crowded quarters in the city to a more spacious campus.

During the first four months of the academic year 1926-27 a situation had gradually developed which contained the possibilities of the serious trouble which subsequently was brought to public notice. President Colvin in his first two addresses to the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts created an atmosphere of insecurity with regard to the tenure of the members of the Faculty and with regard to changes in educational policy proposed by the President. In particular, he alarmed members of the Departments of History and Economics by stating that History should be so taught as to build character, which seemed to imply that the instruction given in History was actually for some reason unsatisfactory, and by stating that teachers of Economics should avoid contentious questions—a policy which, if carried out, would in the opinion of many prevent Economics from being taught. During the same period, President Colvin made a determined effort to abolish the small classes which were actually being held, and having proposed that no class should be offered to fewer than ten students, he secured a rule of the Board of Trustees to the effect that without special permission no class should be offered to fewer than five students. In a letter to Dean Anderson, he stated that the two or three members of the Faculty who were primarily interested in research or graduate work "would

not be happy" in this college and that he preferred that they should change their attitude rather than that they should change institutions. This letter is dated December 17, 1926. At the same time, he repeatedly proclaimed that undergraduate work must be emphasized in preference to graduate work, a policy which it is now admitted had always been and was actually being followed by the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts. But President Colvin succeeded in creating the impression that such emphasis was a new policy of his own. President Colvin also proposed that departmental libraries be removed from their position under the control of various departments, such as, for example, the Speed Scientific School, and be concentrated in the general library, a policy which he later discovered to be unwise and impossible. In a position to which the President was strange, he set out to exercise his power to its full scope from his initial appearance upon the scene.

It is evident that the members of the Department of History in the College of Liberal Arts at this period had reason to fear that the President was pursuing a policy hostile to them. From the evidence given before the Board of Trustees, it is plain that President Colvin in a conversation in January with Dean Anderson, alleged that he had information which would lead to the dismissal of Professor Gottschalk and Miss Landau. Dean Anderson, in a letter dated January 24, 1927,¹ advised the President of the prevailing opinion among a number of people in Louisville that the President was hostile to Jews and that the action he contemplated in these two cases would go far to strengthen this opinion and create a difficult situation. He concluded by saying that he was not informed as to the information President Colvin had against these members of the Faculty. The attempt to procure their dismissal appears then to have been discontinued as a result of Dean Anderson's communication.

Anonymous communications had been appearing during the month of January, 1927, in the Louisville *Courier-Journal* which contained charges that President Colvin was lowering the standards of the University and "playing politics." President Colvin, it appears, attributed at least partial responsibility for these anonymous letters to Professor Gottschalk, but the Committee believes that his impression was incorrect and has testimony to the effect that in at least one case when knowledge of a proposed communication to the news-

¹ See Appendix A.

papers came to Professor Gottschalk, he immediately urged the writer not to communicate it to the papers.

On February 1st, 1927, the Trustees issued a statement assuming responsibility for the President's actions and the trouble appeared to subside.

The next stage in the development of President Colvin's dealings with the History Department brings in a question of gravest importance to university and educational policy, namely, the question of the Board's action and intent in requiring members of the Faculty to sign one-year contracts. The circumstances under which this action was taken by the Board, late in February or early in March, 1927, are still obscure. It has been testified by an ex-member of the Board of Trustees that President Colvin represented to the Board of Trustees that the records of the University were in a condition which might be called chaotic, that negligence on the part of preceding administrations had left the terms of tenure of many individual members of the Faculties totally obscure, and that one of the members of the Board, in discussing the situation, suggested that the issuance of one-year contracts, to be sent out to all members of all faculties who were on a full time basis, would enable the President to clarify the situation by a series of definite understandings with these individuals.¹ It has also been testified without any contradiction by President Colvin that President Colvin, previous to this meeting of the Board, told a member of the Faculty that if year contracts were established no trial would be necessary "when we had to get rid of people," and that he intended to recommend such contracts to the Board. When this member of the Faculty was asked to reconcile his own testimony with that of the Chairman (that the recommendation was made by a member of the Board) he replied that "the apparent way of reconciling them is that that member of the Board made the recommendation on Mr. Colvin's suggestion."²

It also appears from the testimony that in the discussion before the Board, President Colvin made proper and wise representations concerning academic custom and understanding. It does not appear, however, that he energetically opposed a measure which was certain to increase still further the alarm among the Faculty. In any case, the adoption of this measure by the Board was the Board's answer to President Colvin's criticisms concerning the vague status

¹ See Appendix B.

² See Appendix C.

of members of the Faculty and the vague promises made to them by his predecessors. Of course, such a measure as the one-year contract is capable of various interpretations, and subsequently the Board asserted that its purpose was not to disturb tenure but to remove the uncertainties already alluded to. Clearly, then, the real meaning of this ambiguous measure must be judged by the way in which it was administered by the Board and its executive officer, and it must be admitted that the way in which it was actually administered soon justified the apprehensions which the first announcement of the new policy had caused. If the measure was to be, as the Board claimed, merely a means of regularizing the whole situation, and not in the slightest degree a threat, obviously such explanations should have been furnished immediately, as we believe in some cases they were furnished, but not in all. The President also was confronted with the duty of distributing these forms with impartiality throughout all Faculties of the University, at least in so far as concerned men on full time basis. However, it appears from testimony that the distribution of these one-year contracts was neither rapid nor impartial, and in fact, the Committee has reason to believe that a number of members of the Medical School Faculty had not received them until after the Committee had arrived in Louisville, and had begun the investigation.

For these reasons, the Faculty of the Liberal Arts and the Faculty of the Speed Scientific School were particularly affected by the novel policy, whereas the other Faculties of the University remained undisturbed.

This was the situation in general when President Colvin's policy toward the Department of History took a new turn. Professor Johannesen of the Department of History had been appointed two years previously, as Assistant Professor, with the promise that a slight increase in salary should be made each year and that if his services were satisfactory he should be made Associate Professor at the end of the second year. Dean Anderson, in transmitting his recommendation to President Colvin for the year 1927-28, had recommended that Professor Johannesen be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor and receive an increase in salary. When the copy of the one-year contract was sent by the President to Professor Johannesen, he found in it the words "associate professor at a salary of \$2600," the salary he had been receiving in the year 1926-27. Professor Johannesen quite properly wrote a letter to the Board

asking them to reconsider the contract and to give him the increase in salary which seemed to be justified by his increase in rank. In reply, he received a letter from President Colvin of which the concluding phrase is as follows: "If you cannot accept this, please advise me immediately."¹ When this letter was written by President Colvin, Professor Johannesen had, of course, already been re-elected for the succeeding year and had been so advised.

Under these circumstances, President Colvin's letter refusing the increase in salary which had been promised him in previous years and which Dean Anderson had already recommended, appeared to Professor Johannesen to show that the President wished his answer to be a rejection. Professor Johannesen naturally wished for and took time to consider his reply. Professor Johannesen has testified "that there were a number of other persons in the University who had not returned their contracts and who had not received any notice that their services with the University would cease at a certain time." Furthermore, Dr. Cotterill, Head of the Department of History, had informed Professor Johannesen that in conversation with the President, the President had assured Dr. Cotterill that he did not care when these contracts were handed in. Professor Johannesen had already received an offer of a year's contract from another university and had rejected it because it was limited to a period of one year. He testified that one of his reasons for preferring to remain at the University of Louisville was that he believed his tenure was safer at that institution. Without any further action on Professor Johannesen's part, he received President Colvin's letter of March 15th, which stated that Professor Johannesen's services to the University would cease at the end of the summer session.² Professor Johannesen requested a hearing before the Board of Trustees, which was granted to him on March 17th, 1927. Professor Johannesen was reinstated by the Board at this meeting. Professor Johannesen has since resigned in order to teach at another institution.

Professor Gottschalk again appears in this tangled series of events. On March 17th, there was published in the *Louisville Courier-Journal* a statement made by Professor Gottschalk concerning the treatment of his colleague, Professor Johannesen, in which he demanded redress for his colleague's unjust dismissal. He, together with Dr. Cotterill, was summoned before the Board at its meeting of March

¹ See Appendix D.

² See Appendix E.

17th, and upon the termination of the Board's interview with Professor Johannesen, a member of the Board proceeded to examine Professor Gottschalk concerning his statement to the newspapers, his relation to the anonymous letters which had been published in January, and his relation of loyalty or disloyalty to the Board and to President Colvin. In the course of this examination Professor Gottschalk stated that on March 16th he had requested leave of absence in order that he might spend a year at the University of Chicago. This request was made of Dean Anderson. Immediately thereafter, Professor Gottschalk became cognizant of the letter of dismissal which had been received by Professor Johannesen. He returned to Dean Anderson's office, abandoned his request for leave of absence, and offered his resignation. Later on that same day he communicated the statement to the paper to which reference has already been made. Soon after the Board had questioned Professor Gottschalk concerning his own attitude toward the University, the Board, and the President, the Board resolved to accept Professor Gottschalk's resignation.¹ The Board also dismissed Professor Gottschalk from his classes for the remainder of the term and made a public statement in defense of its course. In this statement, the Board made the direct charge that Professor Gottschalk had been the principal inspiration of "a flood of rumor and suspicions wholly unfounded" and that "every effort to set at rest this current has proven futile so long as Professor Louis Gottschalk remained on the campus." Subsequently, the Board made the further charge that Professor Gottschalk "had been guilty of an act of grave disloyalty to the University in his intentional injury to it by rushing to the newspaper."

Meantime, Mr. Arthur D. Allen, one of the members of the Board, had made an attempt to force reconsideration by the Board of its action concerning Professor Gottschalk. His efforts resulted in a vote by the Board of Trustees on April 7th, 1927, in which, by a vote of six to four, the Board refused to rescind its action accepting the resignation of Professor Gottschalk, and dismissing him from his classes, but withdrew that part of its published statement which was to the effect that Gottschalk was the sole or principal source of trouble in the University. In forming an opinion concerning the previous and subsequent course of action of the Board of Trustees, it is important to remember that four members of this Board, for

¹ See Appendix F.

whatever reasons, were resolved to rescind the dismissal of Gottschalk, to refuse his resignation, and to retract in full the public statement directed against him. Mr. Allen subsequently resigned in protest and made a public statement concerning his resignation.¹

On the part of the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School, the revelations made concerning the manner of Professor Johannesen's dismissal and reinstatement over the head of the President, and the dismissal of Professor Gottschalk from his classes, and the extremely grave charges made in the public press by the Board against him, had intensified the belief that only through a real investigation of the causes of dissatisfaction in the college, and in particular of the dismissal of Professor Gottschalk, could any solution be reached. A Faculty meeting was called at noon, Monday, March 21st, by the Dean. A resolution was adopted,² and was transmitted to the President and the Board of Trustees. On March 23rd, a committee of the Faculty was elected to gather material to present to the Board in case such an investigation were made.

The immediate outcome of the Faculty's request for a thorough and impartial investigation was the consent of the Board of Trustees to hold a conference with the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and the Faculty of the Speed Scientific School. This conference lasted through several sessions, of which the first was on March 29th, and the last on April 12th.

The stenographic report of these proceedings covers 566 pages of the original testimony. It is obviously impossible to present this document as a whole, and yet without careful study of this document it is impossible for anyone to be acquainted with many facts which are necessary to an understanding of the situation. Nevertheless, an attempt must be made to summarize the Conference.

One of the Trustees was Chairman of the Conference and on March 29th opened the proceedings with a prayer and a brief speech. He assured those present that it was neither a trial nor an investigation (in the sense of a police investigation) but merely a conference. Assurance was given that everyone should have the opportunity to express his sentiments without being penalized by the Board for anything that was said.³ He assured the Faculties that the Board was composed of disinterested men who had succeeded

¹ See Appendix G.

² See Appendix H.

³ See Appendix I.

in their chosen careers and who had but one object in view—to work together with other departments of the University for a common end in the belief that in this way the truth might be ascertained and remedy for any wrong or trouble would result. He assured them that with reference to the question of preference to be given undergraduate work as against postgraduate work the attitude of Mr. Colvin was simply the attitude of the Board, that Mr. Colvin was carrying out the instructions of the Board. He also made a statement concerning the one-year contracts.¹

Dean Anderson testified that until September, 1926, the College of Liberal Arts was a going concern with a minimum of internal jealousy and internal friction. Since September, a feeling of dissatisfaction had arisen which increased steadily until the Faculty meeting on March 21st, which requested the Board to make an inquiry on behalf of the Faculty. Dean Anderson asked that the Board receive the Faculty report containing its statement of the causes of unrest. The Chairman ruled that the report should not now be received, and that the Conference must proceed according to the fixed plan.²

Mr. Allen objected to the ruling, which was then reaffirmed by the Chairman, and from that moment on the whole Conference was reduced to personal statements made by members of the Faculties who were interrogated at pleasure by members of the Board, but who were refused the privilege of putting any questions themselves.

Dr. J. L. Patterson, Chancellor Emeritus, produced evidence to show that he had always abided by the university custom of tenure of office and that this custom was thoroughly understood and adhered to by him and by the late President Ford. In the course of the ensuing discussion, Dr. Patterson made a statement concerning university procedure and explained as one of the causes of unrest that it was very difficult to make young men who come to the University of Louisville from other institutions understand what is meant when they have a one-year contract submitted to them.

The remainder of the testimony has been summarized by the Committee and is presented under the following headings:³

Rulings of the Board of Trustees

The Board by a formal ruling in the Conference denied the faculty the privilege of putting questions to the Board. (33)

¹ See Appendix J.

² See Appendix K.

³ The figures in parenthesis refer to the page in the three volumes of testimony, "Proceedings of the Conference between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School, University of Louisville."

The Board ruled out of order the Faculty request to be allowed to present their resolution concerning the causes of unrest on the campus. (122)

The Board promised that at some time during the Conference members of the Faculty and of the Board should be given an opportunity to make suggestions of remedies for the situation existing at the University. (402-6)

This discussion of remedies never took place, and the Board denied that such a promise had been made. (523-4)

Educational and Administrative Policy

Essential undergraduate work had been ruled out by the requirement that no course be given to fewer than five students. (80)

The President, when he wished to excuse the absence of an athlete, or other student, made his wishes known to the Dean. (151)

The President distributed the one-year contracts without any accompanying letter of explanation and without any attempt to determine what informal contracts had been in existence. (152)

The President insisted that free extra instruction should be given by members of the Faculty to football players. (169)

The President objected to the presence of married women on the Faculty on the ground that their loyalty was divided. (188)

The President, early in the fall, stated to Dean Anderson in unmistakable terms that graduate work would be discontinued at the end of this year for an indeterminate period. (236)

The President held meetings of a Council composed of the Deans of the five schools and the Registrar. On the question of limitation of classes in the College of Liberal Arts to ten students, Mr. Colvin refused to allow Dean Anderson and the Registrar to vote or to express an opinion. (255)

On the morning of March 17th, the President, upon his personal invitation, held a meeting at which were present Dean Anderson, Dean Brigman, Dean Graves, Dean Lewis, Dean O'Rourke, Dr. Hume, Mr. Tom King (Athletic Director) and Dr. Jenkins, to consider whether this gathering, which usurped the proper function of the regular university Council constituted by the By-laws, would recommend to the Board the immediate dismissal of Professor Gottschalk. (395 ff.)

The President, the Board of Trustees, and the Faculty

The President attributed failure of numerous students to the

quality of the work of the Dean's office, lack of attendance records, and failure of the Faculty to aid students, rather than to the students themselves. (92)

The President misrepresented to the Board the number of small classes being given in the college of Liberal Arts,¹ and the policy and procedure of the Faculty concerning graduate and undergraduate courses. (253)

The President had said previous to the meeting of the Board that he was going to recommend one-year contracts. (45-8)

The President had urged that Economics and History should be taught in such a way as not to raise questions in the minds of the students. (97)

The President had informed the Faculty that the Board had formed its opinion of Dr. Gottschalk from its interview in the Johannesen trial, and from that alone, whereas the President had told Dr. Gottschalk at an earlier interview that the Board was opposed to Dr. Gottschalk, but that he (Colvin) "would do his best for Gottschalk." (102-3)

The President has suppressed Faculty discussion, stating that executive action had been taken by the Board on the subject of small classes, and therefore the discussion of this point by the Faculty must cease. (149)

The President denied that he sent a message ordering reinstatement of failed students. (88)

It was testified that he had sent such a message by telephone. (89)

The President denied that he had sent word to the campus to have Dr. Gottschalk notified of his dismissal and had later recalled the order. (287)

It was testified by the Dean, the Registrar, and by Professor Cotterill that President Colvin had not only asked for the dismissal of Professor Gottschalk and Miss Landau, but that he had on the same day or the day following recalled that order. (555-561)

The President had asked the Head of the History Department to secure the resignation of Dr. Johannesen in order that the President might bring to Louisville a man whom he had in mind. (This man was later appointed to a position in the Department of History in the Summer School.) (286)

Members of the staff of the Speed Scientific School were transferred without notice from the Faculty of the Speed Scientific School to the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts. (197)

¹ See Appendix L.

The President instructed the Dean of the Speed Scientific School not to allow his department heads to know how much money had been allotted them for departmental purposes. (388)

The President's Orders to the Registrar

The President had many times instructed the Registrar to violate the rules of the College of Liberal Arts. In two of these cases Mr. Colvin was personally interested. He had ordered the Registrar to register students whose high school credits were not on file. He had ordered the Registrar to admit without examination students who had never been graduated from high school. (251 ff.)

In particular, in the case of one football player, President Colvin insisted on his registration as a regular student in spite of the fact that a large part of his credits had been obtained under an assumed name, and were in duplicate. (543 ff.)

The President's Library Record

The President had threatened to remove the Chemistry Library and other departmental libraries to the main building. (71)

The President asked an assistant librarian of one year's experience to select for purchase the books needed for the various departments. (101)

The President rejected funds for the purchase of books for the Classical Library offered by Judge Brandeis, on the ground that the library was not needed. (150)

Arbitrary Dismissals by the President

The President abolished the Department of Art. (48 ff.)

The President dismissed members of the Departments of History and English without consulting the heads of those departments, and in one case contrary to the advice of the head of the department.¹ (82)

The President arbitrarily dismissed two members of the Faculty from their positions as advisors to women. (113)

The President's Testimony

The President said that at no time had he passed judgment on a single member of the Faculty further than to say that the teaching ability of this Faculty was of the highest standard. (33)

¹ Compare letter of May 3rd, 1927, to Professor Cotterill, given in full in Appendix M.

The President said that there were thirty-five classes in the College of Liberal Arts whose average number of students was less than two.¹ (442)

The President said that he recommended Faculty meetings. (456)

The President gave his requirements for members of the Faculty: Scholarship, teaching ability, interest in and participation in student activities, extension work on the part of members of the Faculty, no active desire to do research work. (461 ff.)

Miscellaneous

It was testified that up to this year the College of Liberal Arts had been peaceful. (142)

It was testified by various members of the Faculty that Professor Gottschalk was not a cause of unrest among the Faculty, but that the Board's treatment of Professor Gottschalk was. (138 ff.)

It must be noted that the refusal of the Chairman to allow the Faculty Committee to present the material which it had gathered, together with the Board's violation of its promise that all parties to the Conference should have an opportunity to suggest remedies, and its denial to members of the Faculty of the privilege of interrogating the Board, resulted in altering the whole nature of the Conference.

During the Conference, the letter of April 4th already referred to had been sent to Dr. Gottschalk by the Board of Trustees. The Board, on April 7th, adopted the resolution in which they refused to rescind their action of March 17th, but withdrew part of their published statement of March 19th. This letter is dated April 13th.²

Shortly after the Conference, the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts presented to the Board a petition signed by thirty-nine of the forty-seven members, requesting the removal of the President and making twenty-two formal charges against the President's administration. It is clear, therefore, that the unforeseen result of the Conference was to make a wider breach between the Faculty, the Board, and the President than had existed previous to the Conference or during its early stages. The demand for the removal of the President obviously represents a complete change in policy on the part of the Faculty.

¹ See Appendix L.

² See Appendix N.

Such a demand made by thirty-nine members of this Faculty is extremely rare in the history of academic institutions, and the Board, aware that it confronted a situation of the utmost gravity, replied to the Faculty petition in a published statement issued in pamphlet form, in which the charges were dealt with seriatim.¹

On Friday morning, May 6th, there appeared in the press of Louisville the first of a series of statements in answer to the Board's pamphlet, made by a committee of sixteen citizens of Louisville who state that "in giving these facts to the public we are actuated by the desire to protect the interests of the University and to see that justice is done to the Faculty." Once again, it is impossible to analyze in detail the voluminous statements of the Citizens' Committee, but a brief summary may be made of the principal charges.

Published Charges of the Citizens' Committee

The Citizens' Committee charges President Colvin with:

- Illegal alteration of the government of the University.
- Arbitrary and hasty adoption of policies.
- Misrepresentation of the Board to the Faculty and of the Faculty to the Board.
- Violation of academic ethics, reversal of actions of deans, disregard of recommendations of heads of departments.
- Favoritism on behalf of his son and daughter.
- An attempt to create a vacancy in the Department of History in order that he might appoint a personal friend.
- Discourtesy to and calumny of members of the Faculty.
- His charges that the Faculty is primarily interested in graduate work; and his hostility to research and writing.
- His threats of dismissal of members of the Faculty on secret charges and threats of dismissal based on personal antipathy.
- His arbitrary transfer of members of Speed Scientific School Faculty.

On May 26th, the Board of Trustees sent to the press and to each member of the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School a letter which is the most recent public announcement of its position in the controversy. In the course of this letter, the Board refers to its promise that no one would be penalized for anything said during the Conference between the Board of Trustees and the two Faculties, and repeats that the promise will be faith-

¹ See Appendix O.

fully kept; but also makes the statement that its decision of the controversy must be accepted as final, and that its pledge of immunity does not cover the prolongation of the controversy.¹ During June, 1927, the Registrar was notified that the most important part of her duties would be transferred to a newly appointed officer.

The Findings of the Committee.

The Committee has made an earnest endeavor to ascertain all the relevant facts. The Committee knows that in a situation so complicated it is extremely difficult to deliver a complete and reasoned judgment. Nevertheless, the Committee feels it to be a duty to make public its opinion concerning the causes of the trouble at the University of Louisville, and when the Committee points out errors it intends to do so sympathetically, not as hostile external judges, but in order that similar errors may be avoided in the future.

The personnel of the Faculty is of a high character. The Committee finds in the Faculty no evidence of incompetency or lack of devotion to its duties and to the welfare of the University. On the contrary, it finds that every public act of the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School has been determined not by motives of personal interest, but by devotion to their ideals of the proper conduct of a university in a civilized community. It is true that the evidence presented in the Conference contains the statement, among many other items, of various personal grievances. It might appear that these portions of the evidence disprove the findings of the Committee concerning the disinterested motives underlying the action of the Faculties. With respect to this doubt, two facts must be borne in mind. First, it was the Board which at the request of the President of the University ruled against the presentation of the Faculty's general statement, from which more or less trivial personalities had been omitted; and in the second place, it is a fact that no administration can be carried on without producing personal reactions, feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, of approval or disapproval.

It is obvious that the Faculty allowed its conception of devotion to the University to take shape in the form of an extreme course of action, namely, a demand for the resignation of President Colvin; and in the case of one member of the Faculty, Professor Gottschalk, the Committee feels that his resort to the public press is a procedure

¹ See Appendix P.

which is, as a general rule, likely to produce diseases worse than the ills for which a remedy is sought. The Committee, therefore, has no desire to recommend recourse to the public press, by a member of the faculty, as a method of obtaining redress for a colleague. As for the extreme course of action taken by the Faculty, to which the Committee has just referred, it is clear from the evidence that the Faculty made its request for President Colvin's resignation only after the Board of Trustees had by their own rulings altered the Conference from an investigation undertaken in the hope of remedies, to a trial of the President. The Board is therefore directly responsible for the extreme course which the Faculty pursued.

In view of the fact that the Board and the President at one time made the effort in a public statement to place the sole or principal responsibility for the trouble at the University on the shoulders of one man, Professor Gottschalk, the Committee feels itself compelled to say that in its opinion there was not at the time and never has been any justification for the Board's published statement concerning Professor Gottschalk, that the so-called "Gottschalk case" is merely an item in a vast body of facts, and that it cannot be understood or judged apart from the whole history of the year 1926-27 at the University of Louisville.

The President of the University

The Committee wishes to record, for what it is worth, its opinion that President Colvin is undeniably a man of great ability, and perhaps of even greater energy. From the evidence adduced herewith, it is clear that President Colvin, who took up the duties of his office in August, 1926, felt himself sufficiently familiar with the University of Louisville to announce new educational policies in the following month; and it is also in evidence that he coupled with these announcements, which were by themselves sufficient to disturb the peace which should be, but is not always, characteristic of university circles, a series of statements to the general effect that the members of the Faculty were on probation, and that if they passed the test their positions would be secure. Such communications may justifiably be addressed to the youngest members of a faculty, to those who are explicitly instructors upon annual appointment, but when made to a faculty as a whole, the only conceivable justification would be that the entire faculty, having been carefully examined, should have proved to be professionally incompetent to fulfil the duties of instruction

in a reputable institution. This condition did not obtain at the University of Louisville; and the Committee feels that President Colvin's course of action inevitably created a sentiment of insecurity, of apprehension, which from the very beginning made it almost impossible for the President to cooperate normally with those who were responsible for instruction.

The relation which should obtain between a president and the various members of the faculties of a university is not the relation between a sovereign and his subjects, and the attempt to establish such a relation in an American university is an attempt to substitute government by threat and by force for a government by and with the consent of the governed. As for the announcement of new educational policies in the early days of the academic year, it is perfectly clear that President Colvin acted hastily and unwisely, although with the best of intentions. One need not attach any weight to the apprehensions which were undoubtedly felt that he might interfere with the actual teaching of History and Economics in the College of Liberal Arts; it is in evidence that President Colvin merely uttered his own opinions and made no further attempt to enforce any change whatsoever in the instruction which was actually being given. The Committee, therefore, does not feel that the question of academic freedom is directly involved. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that the introduction of new educational policies, no matter what their content and intrinsic worth, is, under the most favorable circumstances, a difficult and delicate undertaking, which requires for its success the possession not only of knowledge but of wisdom, and the willingness to discuss freely and openly and over a considerable period of time the possible defects of these policies, in order that whatever changes take place may be carried out with the minimum of friction and with the understanding and sympathetic support of all concerned. President Colvin did not fulfil these conditions, but acted with a degree of haste which was by itself sufficient to ruin the chances of success of any policy thus set before the Faculty.

President Colvin's opinions concerning the teaching of History and Economics have already been referred to; they do not constitute an educational policy, whatever may be thought of their wisdom. On the other hand, President Colvin's announcement that the Faculty must devote itself to undergraduate instruction constituted an announcement of an educational policy, and it is in evidence that

President Colvin, when he originally made it, was under the impression that it was a new policy. The upshot of months of ardent and sometimes acrimonious debate upon this subject was the ruling of the Board of Trustees, first presented on January 31st, 1927,¹ and reiterated by the Chairman during the Conference, that "if it becomes necessary at any time to give preference as between undergraduate work and postgraduate work the preference will be given to undergraduate work."

There is nothing alarming or portentous or contrary to good educational procedure in such a statement of policy. The Committee finds that this statement of policy does not in the least constitute a departure from the practice of previous years at the University of Louisville; and if the Faculty had put itself in opposition to such a policy, it would have been proof that the Faculty lacked elementary common-sense. How then is it possible for a dispute over this point to have arisen and to have been prolonged? In the opinion of the Committee the responsibility for this dispute lies directly upon President Colvin, and in the second place upon the Board of Trustees. President Colvin announced as a new policy that which had always been the policy of the Faculty, and so far from its being merely a question of preference to be bestowed upon undergraduate instruction, he actually told members of the Faculty that graduate work would be discontinued at the end of this year for an indeterminate period. The reversal of this decision was finally brought about by the Graduate Committee.

President Colvin also stated to Dean Anderson that no member of the Faculty who was primarily interested in research or graduate work would be happy in that College—that is to say, he went on record as believing that an instructor who was primarily interested in research or graduate work was disqualified to be an instructor in undergraduate work in the University of Louisville. President Colvin presented to the Board a policy which demanded preference for undergraduate as against graduate work. President Colvin presented to the Faculty a policy which sought the abolition of graduate work, and even of the smaller and more advanced undergraduate courses. This gulf between the policy recommended to and announced by the Board of Trustees, and the policy which President Colvin was attempting to impose upon the Faculty, adequately explains the bitterness of the debate. The action of the Board merely

¹ See Appendix Q.

consecrated the regular and customary procedure of the Faculty: meantime, the President was in effect threatening with dismissal those members of the Faculty who were primarily interested in graduate or research work. It may be that "primary interest in graduate or research work" is not by itself a complete guarantee of professional competency: it may be that in this imperfect world no such guarantee exists; it may be that if an instructor's primary interest became his exclusive interest, his teaching might suffer by neglect; but failing definite evidence of such neglect, that "primary interest in research or graduate work" should be used as a charge against the competence of a college instructor in a municipal university or in any university whatsoever is both scandalous and ridiculous. The Committee therefore finds that President Colvin presented two distinct issues, one to the Board of Trustees and one to the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts, with the natural result that the Board of Trustees was discussing and finally decided upon a policy which was wholly different from the policy which the President had presented to the Faculty, although it was essentially identical with the policy which the Faculty had been pursuing in the past. As for the policy which President Colvin sought to enforce upon the Faculty, its adoption would gravely impair the value of degrees granted by the University of Louisville. The difference between the two policies is obvious; the Committee is of course unable to determine to what extent President Colvin was aware of that difference.

The inevitable result of President Colvin's presentation to the Board of Trustees and to the Faculty of the two distinct issues under one label was to embroil the Faculty and the Board of Trustees, both of which bodies had hitherto been on the best of terms, although not intimately and personally acquainted. Responsibility for this disaster must be placed on President Colvin alone. Furthermore, the Committee finds that President Colvin did nothing to abate this growing lack of confidence between two important bodies, but on the contrary, aggravated the distrust which the Board was beginning to feel concerning the Faculty of the Liberal Arts and the Faculty of the Speed Scientific School, by insisting that the Faculties were not properly organized, that the "Freshman mortality" rate was excessively high, that the Dean's office was inadequate to the performance of its duties, and in general that "the practices of the past did not meet the demands of the present." The Committee finds that President Colvin, by so doing, misrepresented to the Board

the quality and performance of the Faculties, and that by these exaggerations he prepared the minds of the Board to support him when he proposed drastic changes in personnel and method.

President Colvin further pursued this policy of creating difficulties where none had existed before. He represented to the Board of Trustees that "so much confusion had arisen from verbal contracts, so much misunderstanding had grown out of correspondence that was not known to the Board, so many promises had been made in good faith and by those authorized to make such promises but which unfortunately were not always known to and approved by the Board" that the Board was ultimately induced to demand that the terms and conditions of employment be specified in the so-called one-year contract. President Colvin, in the same speech, declared that the practice in these respects of the Chancellor in the past "sets up an entirely satisfactory standard." It is therefore the finding of the Committee that President Colvin made such representations to the Board of Trustees concerning the quality of previous administrative procedure as to lead directly to the establishment of the unfortunate and ill-administered one-year contracts. It is on record that President Colvin made a speech, at a meeting of the Board, in opposition to the establishment of these one-year contracts. The Committee finds that President Colvin's speech before the Board was inconsistent with his previous representations and with his subsequent practice, and that it does not exonerate him from the gravest responsibility.¹

The Committee has already referred to President Colvin's statement that members of the Faculty were on probation. Early in the academic year 1926-27 President Colvin proceeded to reveal in action the meaning which he had attached to this apparently vague but menacing phrase. President Colvin's interview and correspondence with Mr. Hill Shine reveal that on October 6th, 1926, Mr. Shine was confronted with the following alternative: "Either you will want to apologize and pledge honest and entire loyalty to the work we are attempting, or you will want to offer your resignation." On September 13th, 1926, lectures had begun in the College of Liberal Arts. In a single interview, President Colvin had gathered sufficient evidence concerning the professional competency and "loyalty" of a young instructor in the English department to impel

¹ The Committee of course is referring to the policy as actually carried out at Louisville, and not to those "one-year contracts," found at various other universities, where such contracts are a mere legal formality and not a threat to tenure.

him to present this young instructor with an alternative which involved his professional future. There appears to have been no basis for any charge of professional incompetency against Mr. Shine.¹

From October, 1926, on, rumors of dismissal added to the unrest which President Colvin's own announcements had already created in the Faculty. As a ground for these threatened dismissals, lack of professional competency seems to have been more or less abandoned, and in its place President Colvin adopted, as for example in the case of Dr. Gottschalk and Miss Landau, vague charges that he had "information which would lead to their dismissal," and the mysterious accusation of "disloyalty" which was particularly pressed against Dr. Gottschalk.

In reply to President Colvin's statement threatening the dismissal of Dr. Gottschalk and Miss Landau, Dean Anderson, in his letter of January 24th, 1927, urged President Colvin not to take such action, since the dismissal of these two members of the Faculty would lend color to charges of anti-Semitism which had already been made against President Colvin. President Colvin immediately reversed himself and accepted the suggestion of Dean Anderson. It is in evidence that during the Conference, President Colvin repeatedly denied that he had ever been in possession of knowledge which would lead to the dismissal of these two members of the Faculty. Immediately after Dean Anderson's letter was read into the testimony, President Colvin in reply to a direct question said: "I will state I have no such knowledge; that I never had any such knowledge as that."² That is to say, the information upon which the President had based his serious charges of January had by April completely vanished, and its possessor asserts that he never had it.

President Colvin, then, attempted to prevent the re-appointment of Dr. Gottschalk and Miss Landau upon evidence which the President later denied that he had ever possessed.

President Colvin's dealings with the various members of the History Department constitute a strange record. The members of this Department are generally admitted to have been of excellent professional and personal standing. For some obscure reason, President Colvin was particularly hostile to the members of this Department. The details of President Colvin's actions have already been related. The Committee finds that President Colvin's attempt to dismiss

¹ This account is derived from correspondence submitted to the committee.

² "Proceedings of the Conference," page 526.

Professor Johannesen was adequately judged by the Board of Trustees, who administered to the President a stern rebuke, by immediately reversing the President's action. It is the opinion of the Committee that President Colvin's persecution of the members of the Department of History deserves a place in the annals of administrative error for its audacity and for its lack of justification.

President Colvin's attitude of hostility toward members of the Faculty who indulged in research or graduate work finds its perfect counterpart in his affectionate dealings with special students who had never been graduated from high school, but were capable of playing football, and toward ordinary students who had failed in more than half their courses and were therefore, by Faculty ruling, subject to dismissal. In the case of these latter students, President Colvin's arbitrary overruling of Faculty action is not only a grave administrative error, but demonstrates his lack of respect for the standards of undergraduate scholarship, which are not too high, it may be asserted with confidence, in any existing university or college. It is in evidence that President Colvin charged the Faculty with neglect of its duties toward these derelict students.

The Committee finds that if there is any truth whatever in this charge of President Colvin's, and if the Faculty was in the slightest degree negligent, a proper and just performance of its duties would have resulted not in the retention of these students, as demanded by President Colvin, but in their rejection. President Colvin and members of the Board claimed that his course of action was justified by the subsequent success of some of these students. It is, or should be, a matter of common knowledge that a fairly large percentage of students who fail to attain the standards set by their University are intellectually capable of reaching this standard, and fail to do so because of deliberate neglect of their appointed work. To reward them with their degree, as a result of forced labor, is not good educational policy. It tends to spread the already too general belief that the student may acquire an education by having it given to him.

The Committee finds that President Colvin's attitude toward such an important administrative officer as the Registrar is not characterized, to say the least, by that "spirit of cooperation and loyalty" which he demands from others. President Colvin has repeatedly interfered in the proper conduct of the Registrar's office, and has attempted to use that office as an instrument in the breaking down of the Faculty's rules and standards. The Committee finds

that the Registrar's conduct of her office has been, within human limitations, unimpeachable, and the Committee regards the action of President Colvin and the Board of Trustees in June, 1927, in ordering effectively, though not nominally, the demotion of Miss Kirwan from the office of Registrar, as a violation of the pledge given to the Faculty by the Board and as a continuation of a series of administrative errors here noted. Whether deliberate or not, this violation of the Board's pledge destroys the confidence which that pledge was intended to restore.

One of the most remarkable features of President Colvin's administration has been his iteration of demands for "loyalty." It is President Colvin's opinion, apparently, that this "loyalty" should be manifested toward "the declared purposes of the University," and it is evident from his conduct that President Colvin maintains that the declared purposes of the University are identical with, and incarnate in, the person of the President.¹

Any critical discussion of policies proposed by the President, or of any of the President's acts, produced upon him the impression that the maker of such criticism was "disloyal." For example, after the Board of Trustees had made its declaration concerning the preference to be given undergraduate studies, President Colvin charged with disloyalty those members of the Faculty who persisted in discussing the very different policy which, as has already been shown, he was seeking to enforce upon the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts.

The sort of "loyalty" which President Colvin seems to have demanded is not loyalty, but subservience, and somewhat resembles the disciplinary subordination of a company to its lieutenant, or of employees to a foreman. It does not, however, rise to a plane of moral equality with such disciplinary subordination. President Colvin's conception of "loyalty" is exclusively unilateral. The Committee cannot too strongly condemn the attempt to introduce such a conception of "loyalty" into the administration of a reputable college or university. It is impossible, and rightly so, to suppress critical discussion by members of a faculty, of general or special educational policies, unless that end is accomplished by the simple

¹ Cf. the following passage, taken from Mr. Colvin's letter to Dean Anderson of October 14th, 1926:

"We have a right to expect a spirit of cooperation and loyalty to the declared purposes of the University. This I am sure we shall have, once we come to know one another.

I am just as much concerned that they should show this attitude towards the Dean as that they should show it towards the President."

and drastic means of dismissing that faculty. The attempt to abolish such discussion among the members of the Faculty of the University of Louisville, in the center of a highly civilized community, is not only a deplorable anachronism, but tends to destroy the values which can be created only by patient and tolerant effort, by free and open discussion, and by the gradual increase of a common stock of wisdom, which is incapable of monopolization by any administrative officer.

The Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville is composed of men of proved ability and of high standing in the community. Nevertheless, this Board of Trustees has, during the academic year 1926-27, allowed itself to act precipitately, and to commit a number of serious administrative errors.

When the Board made its public statement of January 31st, 1927, concerning the preference to be given to undergraduate studies,¹ it was attempting to answer charges which had been made in the public press, that the standards of the University of Louisville were being lowered. In this declaration of educational policy the Board assumed the entire responsibility for the policy of the University. That is to say, the Board defended the policy which had been recommended to it by President Colvin, and it defended that policy upon the basis of entirely inadequate and misleading statements which had been made to it by President Colvin. The Committee finds no fault with the Board for having felt, as is quite natural, a high degree of confidence in the man whom it had so recently appointed to the presidency, but it is also true that no Board of Trustees, the members of which are not thoroughly and intimately and personally familiar with the educational practice of a faculty, should venture to lay down an educational policy without first having made a thorough and painstaking inquiry from the regular officers and committees of the faculty concerned. The Committee has already set forth the manner in which President Colvin had on the one hand persuaded the Board that the Faculty was actually neglecting its undergraduate students, while on the other hand he was threatening with dismissal those members of the Faculty who were primarily interested in graduate or research work. Under these special circumstances, the Board's statement concerning educational policy which was, as a matter of fact, merely a formulation of the regular and customary procedure of the Faculty, appeared to the Faculty

¹ See Appendix Q.

to be the Board's seal of approval upon a wholly different policy, upon, that is to say, the policy of abolishing small classes and graduate work which President Colvin had sought to impose upon the Faculty.

In the second place, the Board of Trustees acted with precipitation when it adopted the policy of the "one-year contracts." Once more, its action was plainly due to inadequate and misleading information which was supplied to it by its own appointee, and once more it must be said that the confidence which the Board naturally felt in its appointee did not exonerate it from the necessity of testing that information from other sources. The Board has stated in the Pamphlet that "it was the view of the Board that an agreement of a teacher to perform service was like any other contract for personal service," and that, to obviate uncertainty concerning tenure, it was better that the contracts be for a specific term of service. The Board sought by this means to remedy an evil which did not exist, and events promptly demonstrated the unwisdom of legislating against imaginary evils. The issuance of these one-year contracts inevitably increased the indignation which was already felt among the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School; and their conviction that President Colvin regarded these one-year contracts as weapons which he could employ against the tenure of members of these two Faculties was strengthened by the fact that the one-year contracts were not immediately and impartially distributed throughout the University. Furthermore, the Board cannot be exonerated from its responsibility for having adopted an improper means to remedy an imaginary evil. The Board has emphasized its legal point of view by stating that an agreement of a teacher to perform service is like any other contract for personal service. It is impossible to emphasize too strongly the difference between the legal point of view and a point of view which takes account of all relevant facts. The legal point of view does not take account of the professional point of view, and the professional point of view is a relevant fact. It may be legally irrelevant that the service of a teacher is unlike that of other persons who contract to perform personal service, but the difference in fact between the contracts of teachers and those which are made for the performance of services extraneous to the teaching profession is not irrelevant to the successful conduct of a university. On the contrary, if the members of a Board of Trustees fail to acquaint themselves with that difference, and with the professional standards and obligations which are imposed by

the profession and by no legal power whatsoever, they render themselves incapable of wise and adequate performance of the duties for which they were appointed and of the wise exercise of the powers with which they are legally vested. This Board of Trustees, like most, is composed of gentlemen who have succeeded in the various walks of life, but success in one walk of life does not justify, although it may encourage, the hasty use of the supreme legal power which is vested in the Board by its Charter.

Inasmuch as the Board had established the one-year contracts, the Board cannot escape its share of the responsibility for the unwarranted and violent attempt made by President Colvin to dismiss Professor Johannesen. It is true that the Board, when acquainted with the facts of Professor Johannesen's case, instantly reversed the action of President Colvin, and reinstated Professor Johannesen; but it is also true that the Board failed to take account of its own responsibility for the unfortunate situation in which Professor Johannesen had found himself, when it proceeded not merely to accept the resignation of Professor Gottschalk, but to dismiss him from his classes for the remainder of the year, and to add to this injury the statement in the public press signed by the full Board including the President, which accused Professor Gottschalk of being solely or principally responsible for the existing dissatisfaction on the campus. The Board should have remembered that it had just succeeded in preventing President Colvin from doing a grave injustice to Professor Johannesen, and that it owed its opportunity of affording redress to Professor Johannesen to the undoubtedly courageous and disinterested, although very likely indiscreet, intervention of Professor Gottschalk. In the presence of a wrong done to a colleague, a courageous and disinterested young man need not be too severely censured if the manner in which he seeks to obtain redress is not perfectly discreet. Professor Gottschalk was before the Board for the stipulated purpose of appearing as a witness on behalf of Professor Johannesen, and the Board, which should have felt and manifested its gratitude to Professor Gottschalk, for saving it from committing an injustice, proceeded instead to put Professor Gottschalk on trial. The Board, of course, was entitled to accept Professor Gottschalk's resignation. It would have been clearly entitled, after having made due inquiry, to censure Professor Gottschalk for making a statement in the public press as a means of securing redress for a colleague, although it may be said in passing

that hasty recourse to the public press seems to be not infrequent in Louisville, and is not confined to inexperienced young men. But the Board had very little justification for its hasty and utterly incorrect decision that Professor Gottschalk was the sole or principal cause of unrest at the University, or for its published statement of March 19th, 1927, to that effect. Therefore, the Board had no justification for its dismissal of Professor Gottschalk from his classes for the rest of the year. If the charges on which the Board based this dismissal had been true, they were nevertheless of so grave a nature that they placed the Board under the absolute obligation of thorough and painstaking inquiry before taking any action. But once more the Board acted in haste, and once more the Board based its action upon misinformation supplied to it by President Colvin.

The Board of Trustees should remember that under modern conditions the power and prestige of a university president are so great that they sometimes constitute a very real temptation, and occasionally encourage an arbitrary use of such power. The Board should constantly bear in mind that the mere proposal by a president, during the early days of his administration, of any considerable change in personnel or policy is *prima facie* evidence that the president is acting unwisely and in haste; and bearing this in mind, the Board should employ every proper means to prevent the president from mistaking mere speed for wise and effective action.

On April 7th, after the Board had acquired further information in the course of its Conference with the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School, the Board passed a resolution withdrawing its allegation that Professor Gottschalk "was the sole or principal cause of unrest in the University of Louisville." The Board as a whole has taken no steps to apologize for the unjust dismissal from classes which it had based largely upon this allegation. It is greatly to the credit of the Board that four of its members voted to rescind both the dismissal from classes and the acceptance of the resignation of Professor Gottschalk. The generosity and the uncommon good sense displayed by these four members of the Board stand in vivid contrast to the decision which was actually made.

During the Conference between the Board of Trustees and the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School, the Board had an excellent opportunity to acquire the full and correct information which it needed, inasmuch as a general

statement had been carefully drawn up by a committee of the Faculties. The Board did not avail itself of this opportunity. President Colvin objected to the presentation of this Faculty report on the ground that his life was at stake, and insisted that the Conference should be limited to statements made by individuals.¹ The Chairman's ruling in favor of President Colvin, and the acceptance of his ruling by the other members of the Board increased the difficulty of arriving at any peaceful and impersonal settlement of the difficult situation which existed in the two schools.

To this extent, then, the Board is responsible for the failure of the Conference to produce an adequate remedy. A series of grave administrative errors had been committed by the President, and for these errors the Board had assumed full responsibility. It may be said that the letter of the Board of Trustees of May 26th, 1927, which contains the promise of the Board that members of the Faculty will henceforth be secure in their just prerogatives, possessing academic freedom and the right to express in a proper way their opinions on university matters, affords to these Faculties adequate guarantees against the repetition of such errors in the future; and there is not the slightest doubt that this promise was given in good faith. But the Board refers with emphasis to the fact that the law vests in it the authority and places upon it the responsibility for a decision of the controversy. That is undoubtedly true. The Board proceeds to say that "its decision must be accepted as final." That is undoubtedly correct within the bounds of the Board's legal power. In view, however, of the disturbed state of opinion at Louisville the Board might well be reminded that its legal power cannot force public opinion to accept a decision which is regarded by many as contrary to the facts and the evidence. And in particular, it should be remembered that this decision of the Board was made, not by an impartial external judge, but by parties to the case. In effect, the Board has sustained its own record and that of its President, and in effect the Board threatens with dismissal anyone who refuses to "accept" its decision.

The Board, therefore, instead of providing a remedy for the existing insecurity of tenure, has increased that insecurity. In effect, the Board has demanded that the Faculty approve its own insecurity of tenure. By this demand, the Board itself has gone far to nullify the value of its promise. In view of the powers pos-

¹ See Appendix R.

essed by the President of the University, and in view of the fact that President Colvin's exercise of these powers has throughout the year been attended not only by disregard of the established and proper customs of university administration, but also by serious contraventions of the By-Laws of the University and of contracts duly made, and in view of the fact that the Board has voluntarily assumed responsibility for all the official acts of President Colvin, it is clear that, contrary to the desire and intent of the Board, the value of the Board's promise is still further diminished.

President Colvin began his career in office by creating insecurity of tenure among the Faculty and by proposing policies which would alter, if not destroy, the educational standing of the University; and the responsibility for the losses which the Faculty, and not only the Faculty but the University, have suffered, falls directly on President Colvin and the Board which has hitherto sustained him, very likely out of admirable motives of loyalty. There is a difference between action and promises, and until the Board can bring itself to take such executive action as will restore normal security of tenure to the Faculties of the University of Louisville, and will maintain the educational and administrative standards which previous to this year have been maintained, the University will continue to suffer, and will be unable to render in full measure those high services to education and to the community which proper action on the part of the Board would enable it to resume.

The Board is well aware, and has repeatedly emphasized the fact, that it is in possession of supreme legal power over the University of Louisville. The possession of such power never does exonerate, and never will exonerate, its possessor from the supreme moral obligation of rendering a decision in accordance with justice, a decision which is substantially based upon the facts. Until the Board has rendered such a decision, no one outside the Board can regard this controversy as terminated.

APPENDIX A

January 24th, 1927

My dear President Colvin:

After our conversation this morning concerning Miss Landau and Dr. Gottschalk a thought occurred to me that should be brought to your attention.

The opinion prevails among a number of people in Louisville that you are hostile to Jews. For this opinion I am sure that no one connected with the

University is responsible. However it does exist outside of University circles.

You will readily appreciate that the action you contemplate in these two cases would go far to strengthen this opinion and create for you a difficult situation.

Please understand that I am not informed as to the information you have. In Miss Landau's case particularly I should need some very positive testimony to shake my faith in a woman in whose integrity and character I have great confidence.

Very truly yours,

W. M. ANDERSON, *Dean*

APPENDIX B

Pamphlet, "Conclusions of the Board of Trustees," page 7.

But it was the view of the Board that an agreement of a teacher to perform service was like any other contract for personal service, the general rule as to which is that, in the absence of a term of service fixed by the contract, it is terminable by either party upon reasonable notice to the other; and that to obviate this uncertainty, it was better that the contracts be made for a specific term of service. This was the conclusion reached by the Board. The thought was not suggested by Mr. Colvin, but was rather opposed by him, because of what he said he knew to be the general understanding among teachers.

The making of these contracts does not mean that the Board expects to make changes in the Faculty at the end of every year. It will be to the interest of the University, as well as of the teachers, to keep good teachers so long as they continue efficient and faithful. But it is the belief of the Board that the contractual relations between the Board and the members of the Faculty should be definite. And it is essential that the Board and the teacher each year, early in the calendar year, shall know certainly just what the situation is to be for the coming scholastic year. This is necessary to the preparation of catalogues and arrangement of the curriculum.

APPENDIX C

"Proceedings of the Conference," pages 44, 45, 46.

Dr. Cotterill: . . . I have been dissatisfied with his breaking of the contracts. I have been here seven years, as I have said. Most of that time I have had no contract, except that contract of indefinite tenure, which was a very real contract. This year that was broken by the Board of Trustees, acting, I suppose, on Mr. Colvin's recommendation. It was a breaking of the contract.

Mr. Bruce: Why do you assume it was on Mr. Colvin's recommendation?

Dr. Cotterill: Because he told me before he went into the meeting with you, that this meeting of the Board was going to be held and told me why.

Mr. Bruce: Did he tell you that he had recommended it?

Dr. Cotterill: He told me he was going to.

Mr. Bruce: I don't see how he could have done that, because he was certainly mistaken.

Mr. Jouett: You have heard Mr. Bruce's statement, it was made by a member of the Board.

Mr. Bruce: The suggestion was made by another member of the Board.

Dr. Cotterill: The statements are not contradictory.

Mr. Bruce: Can you reconcile them?

Dr. Cotterill: I can reconcile them.

Mr. Bruce: I would be glad to hear you do it.

Dr. Cotterill: Of course, the apparent way of reconciling them is that that member of the Board made the recommendation on Mr. Colvin's suggestion. Anyway, I made the statement that Mr. Colvin spoke to me about this before the Board met, and we talked about it.

Mr. Bruce: You have no way of knowing, Professor, how often the Board has talked over things of that kind. We meet very frequently.

Dr. Cotterill: He told me that one of the reasons for having this indefinite tenure was because it made necessary a trial for people that would be removed, whereas, if they had year contracts, the trial would not be necessary when we had to get rid of people. That seemed to me to be perfectly plain. I have been dissatisfied with that.

APPENDIX D

March 3rd, 1927

Dr. Rolf Johannesen

Department of History

University of Louisville

My dear Dr. Johannesen:

I regret very much that the salary offered to you for the coming year is not satisfactory to you.

All promises made to faculty members for the current year have been faithfully carried out. Any promise extending into the year 1927-28 would have to be confirmed by the Board. The Board knew of no promise made to you granting an increase in salary for the year 1927-28, and confirmed no promise to this effect. This misunderstanding merely confirms the wisdom of having written contract, or its equivalent, approved by the Board for the protection of both parties and for the prevention of any complication.

I realize that the salaries paid to our faculty members are pitifully low. I wish we were able to pay more. We are confronted by the necessity of increasing our faculty out of our limited funds. For these reasons, I do not think you can expect any increase above the sum approved by the Board.

If you cannot accept this, please advise me immediately.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE COLVIN, *President*

APPENDIX E

"Proceedings of the Conference," page 497.

"Twelve days elapsed. Dr. Johannesen made no reply. He made no request for an interview; he made no request for an appeal to the Board. On March 15th, I wrote Dr. Johannesen again as follows:

'On March 3rd, I wrote to you indicating the terms under which you would be employed for the year 1927-28. In this letter, I stated specifically that if you could not accept the contract under the terms outlined, you should advise me immediately.

You have neither written nor talked with me about the matter.

I am assuming from your silence that you have rejected employment under the terms stated. Acting upon this assumption, permit me to advise you that your service with the University shall terminate at the end of the summer term.

GEORGE COLVIN, *President* "

APPENDIX F

Pamphlet, "Conclusions of the Board of Trustees," pages 10 and 11.

At this hearing of Professor Johannesen's appeal, Professor Gottschalk appeared before the Board. He says he appeared before the Board only as a witness for Professor Johannesen and not as a person on trial himself. And this is true. But at this hearing, he stated facts as to his own conduct, and evidently stated them correctly. He has never offered to retract any of them. It was from his own lips that the Board learned of the time and circumstances of his call to the University of Chicago and of his determination to go there before he ever heard of the Johannesen trouble, and of his hurried statement to the press of this trouble, and that he had resigned on account thereof, with the other information he gave concerning other alleged dismissals. Moreover, his whole attitude and demeanor before the Board was defiant, offensive, and definitely hostile.

At the time of this hearing before the Board, Professor Gottschalk had already resigned, though his resignation was made effective at the end of the scholastic year, June 20th, 1927. The Board determined to accept his resignation and to continue his salary to the end of the year, but it also felt that he had been guilty of an act of grave disloyalty to the University in his intentional injury to it by rushing to the newspaper, as above explained. And, furthermore, the Board was satisfied, from his own demeanor and attitude before the Board at this hearing, that he was hostile to the university, that his days of usefulness there as a teacher were past, and that his influence on the campus and in the classroom for the remaining three months of the term would be a disrupting one, and not for the good of the school. The Board, therefore, while continuing his salary to the end of the scholastic year, determined to relieve him of all further duties as a teacher, which it did.

It is true at that time the Board also thought that Professor Gottschalk was the sole, or certainly the chief, cause of the unrest in the university in the Department of Liberal Arts. And it said so in a statement which the Board published two days after the meeting, to wit, on March 19th. It subsequently found that it was in error in that particular, and has withdrawn that statement. This, however, does not mean that the Board thought he was not a disturber, for we did and do now think he was, but we had found out that he was not the sole source of the trouble on the campus. It had developed that he had several able assistants.

APPENDIX G

Copy of clipping from *Louisville Herald Post*, May 4th, 1927.

Hon. Arthur A. Will, Mayor

Louisville, Ky.

My dear Mr. Mayor:

Now that the University endowment campaign is over, kindly accept at once my resignation of April 23rd, as trustee of the University of Louisville.

I appreciate your courtesy in asking me to reconsider my resignation, but I am quite sure that no good purpose can be served by my remaining a member of the Board. I have publicly stated that I am not in sympathy with the attitude and policy of the other trustees with reference to the present controversy, and my presence would therefore be painful and embarrassing to both myself and the other members. With all due respect to everyone concerned, I will not be a party to what I believe is a piece of cruel oppression (of the faculty) that will go down as unique in American university history. It is my purpose to join with the citizens of Louisville in taking such action as may be proper to effect the removal of what I know to be the cause of the condition now existing in the university. With that purpose in view, I do not think it fair to the other members of the Board that I should continue to sit in their deliberations.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR D. ALLEN

APPENDIX H

Louisville, Ky.

March 21st, 1927

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Faculty that there is widespread dissatisfaction on the campus of the University, and they wish to ask the Board of Trustees for a thorough and impartial investigation of the causes of this dissatisfaction.

_____ I do endorse the above resolution

_____ I do not endorse the above resolution

(Note: Check opposite the statement with which you agree.)

42 endorsed the resolution.

6 voted against it.

APPENDIX I

"Proceedings of the Conference," pages 2 and 7.

Regarding the Board's pledge of immunity for anything said by members of the Faculty during the Conference, Mr. Bruce stated:

We want an opportunity for everyone to express his sentiments. Right here let me say, that while we have a stenographic reporter present, let no one be afraid of that. No one will be penalized for anything he or she might say here tonight. After the transcript has been made anyone will have the liberty to

see it—anyone of you will have the liberty to see it. We only want what is said taken down correctly, so there may be no doubt about the views of anyone. The purpose of the reporter is not to make a record against anyone, but simply for the reasons I have stated. (Page 2.)

I believe that is all I want to say in this opening statement to you. Now I want to call on you to say what you think. I want to call on each one. If we do not get through tonight, we will get through some other night. I want to call on everybody here to express openly and frankly and without fear of penalty, what he knows and what he thinks. (Page 7.)

Pamphlet, "Conclusions of the Board of Trustees," page 14

The Board's pledge of immunity is reiterated:

In opening the conference he (Mr. Bruce) stated in effect that it was to be a conference; that every member of the two faculties, to wit, the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and of the Speed Scientific School, would be called on according to the alphabetical order of the particular department he belonged to, and would be given full and free opportunity to say anything he cared to say.

Furthermore, the assurance was given that no one would be penalized for the free expression of his opinions. Everyone was called upon by name, thinking that possibly some might be deterred by modesty from coming forward with a statement of his views unless called upon specifically. It was the desire of the board that everyone should have full and free opportunity to say what he thought without fear of results.

See also Appendix P, letter of Board of Trustees of May 26th to members of the faculty and to the press, which also reiterates the Board's pledge of immunity.

APPENDIX J

"Proceedings of the conference," page 5

Mr. Bruce: On the subject of the contracts that have been offered to you professors and teachers, let me state this fact: Again, I will say that the suggestion of a one-year contract—a contract for a definite period of time—did not come from Mr. Colvin. It came from a member of the Board, a business man, who said he believed that when people entered into contractual relation, it ought to be in writing, and it ought to be definite. Furthermore, without that contract, it is a principle of the law of Contracts, on which you can ask the advice of any lawyer, that where a contract for personal service is made, and no limit in time is fixed for the contract, it is terminable by either party upon giving reasonable notice to the other party. So that, in the absence of a contract for a year or two years or five years, whatever may be chosen—in the absence of such a contract, either you or the University could terminate your relations upon giving notice to the other. Therefore, in having a contract for a year, your position is no less secure, no less permanent than it was before. And there is no thought in the world of having a wholesale change in the Faculty at the expiration of every year. As a matter of course, a member of the faculty who is himself satisfied and the University is satisfied he is doing good work, there will be no more thought of

changing him or her at the end of that year than there would be if there was no fixed period in the contract. So much for that.

Those are two subjects that I have seen frequently discussed in the papers and by people who have talked to me, and I wanted to give that simple statement of facts to you on those subjects.

Now, there has been a discussion of who should employ teachers and professors. I use the word "teachers" as covering all who teach, whether they are doctors or deans or professors or what not. There has been also discussion as to who should grant leave of absence. That is a matter which the Board of Trustees thinks is within its jurisdiction, and that of no one else.

APPENDIX K

"Proceedings of the Conference," page 10

Mr. Bruce: Let me make this statement: When we determined to call this conference for this evening—and it is a conference—we determined that we would call by name every man and woman in the audience, to speak his own views if he wanted to. Those that do not care to say anything, of course, don't have to. Those that do, everyone of them shall be given the opportunity to do so. Now, the Board may be willing to receive the statement in writing of Dr. Fowler, if he chooses to file it; but I believe in view of the question that has arisen here on the floor, that we had better pursue the course that we determined upon when we called the conference, and that is just what I have stated to you. And we determined, furthermore, to call for the expression of views without any arrangement of individuals as to who should speak first or last.

APPENDIX L

Classes given in the College of Liberal Arts, Second Semester, 1925-26 with fewer than three students in them.

Course	No. enrolled	Memoranda
Greek 2	2	Taught by a man teaching full time exclusive of this course.
Latin 1b	2	Taught by a man teaching full time exclusive of these courses. Last two in nature of research and advanced reading with a student in whom he was personally interested.
Latin 105	1	
Latin 110	1	
Art 2	1	Laboratory courses carried on at same time as other laboratory courses. Did not require additional time of instructor.
Art 3	1	
Art 11	1	
Chem 2	1	Large class given at school of Medicine, but only one student enrolled from College.
Chem 12	1	
Chem 50	1	
Chem 62	2	Laboratory courses. Did not require extra instructional time.
Chem 60	2	
Chem 61	1	

Home Ec. 14	1	Practice teaching.
Home Ec. 15	1	
Physics 70	1	Taught by a man teaching full time exclusive of this course.

—
20

This analysis made by Miss Kirwan, Registrar, for me, April, 1927.

A. D. ALLEN:

APPENDIX M

May 3rd, 1927

Dr. R. S. Cotterill,
Department of History,
University of Louisville.

My dear Dr. Cotterill:

I just want you to know that I appreciate your loyalty and your spirit of cooperation. This, however, you must understand; it is not the function of the head of a department to select the members of his department; it is not the function of the head of a department to determine the salaries to be paid to the men in his department.

I shall always be glad to consult you about these matters, but you must understand that final judgment in these matters will be exercised by me before referring them to the Board. Teachers wishing to discuss such matters should be referred to the President or to the Dean.

I do not believe that we would be justified in paying Johannesen more than he has been offered. I know that we can strengthen our History Department by providing a course such as you and I have discussed. In saying this, I am not questioning your judgment. I am thinking also of Johannesen's future. I believe that he has a limited future here. I am looking at it from a larger viewpoint.

Johannesen should not remain here under any false impression, nor should he remain unless he is satisfied.

With this understanding, I think you and I can work happily together without any cause whatever for misunderstanding.

Your friend,

GEO. COLVIN, *President*

APPENDIX N

University of Louisville
Louisville, Ky.

April 13th, 1927

Dr. Louis R. Gottschalk,
2003 South Second Street,
Louisville, Ky.

My dear Dr. Gottschalk:

As Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville, permit me to advise you that acting upon your letter of April 5th, 1927, the Board of Trustees, on April 7th, adopted the following resolution, to wit:

"That we stand by and decline to rescind our action upon the resignation of Dr. Gottschalk on March 17th, 1927, but that we withdraw so much of our published statement of March 19th, 1927, as was to the effect that he was the sole or principal cause of the unrest in the University of Louisville."

Yours very truly

HARRY A. DAVIDSON, *Secretary*

APPENDIX O

Summary of the Pamphlet "Conclusions of the Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville concerning the Recent Controversy with Certain Members of the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and Speed Scientific School."

The Board refused the request of the Faculties; at the same time it pledged itself to "endeavor to build up the University and do everything in our power for its advancement" (2);

Defended Mr. Colvin's appointment (3,4);

Denied that Mr. Colvin had played politics, lowered the standards of the University, and made bad appointments (5);

Asserted that the Board was in substantial agreement with the Faculties of the University with respect to undergraduate and postgraduate work (6);

Stated the position of the Board concerning the one-year contracts, asserting that Mr. Colvin was not in the slightest degree responsible for them (6,7);

Asserted that "the immediate cause of the present trouble is what may be referred to as 'The Gottschalk Case' " (7);

Admitted that Gottschalk appeared before it only as a witness for Professor Johannesen, and not as a person on trial himself (10);

Justified its action alleging that Professor Gottschalk had violated his pledge of loyalty given in the letter of February 21st, and added as additional justification a reference to Gottschalk's defiant and hostile attitude on March 17th, 1927 (12);

Referred to the split in the Board of six to four against Gottschalk's reinstatement (13);

Defined the Conference as "full and free opportunity" for the Faculty to say anything they cared to, without penalty for the free expression of their opinions (14);

Referred to its ruling against the asking of questions by the members of the Faculty, and made the statement that: "no one ever sought to ask a question that was not permitted to do so,"¹ and in a number of instances members of the Faculty did interpose statements, explanations, and questions" (15);

Justified its ruling against the Faculty request that reporters be admitted (16);

Justified its refusal to enter into a separate discussion on the subject of remedies (16);

Stated that the Faculties making complaints are only two out of five in the University (16, 17);

Attributed the unrest to the policies of the Board and to misunderstandings (17);

Admitted that Mr. Colvin may have made mistakes (17);

¹ This statement is contrary to the evidence.

With regards to dismissals of faculty members, it justified them in general on the basis of the letter written by Dean Anderson on January 5th, asserting that Mr. Colvin should not be criticized for carrying out the recommendations of the Dean (18);

Supported Mr. Colvin in regard to his ideals of teaching history (22);

Referred to the charter of the University which places upon the Board the responsibility for the conduct of University affairs and said: "This responsibility cannot be delegated to others and we do not intend to shirk it." (23);

And concluded by a detailed reply to the Faculty reasons for requesting the resignation of President Colvin.

The foregoing statement is dated April 22nd, and is signed by the following members of the Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville: John W. Barr, Jr., Helm Bruce, Harry A. Davidson, William Heyburn, E. S. Jouett, Fred W. Keisker, J. C. Murphy, Alfred Selligman, and W. S. Speed.

APPENDIX P

May 26th, 1927

Dear _____

This letter is written to each member of the faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the Speed Scientific School of the University of Louisville, who have accepted appointment for the coming year, regardless of what his attitude may have been in the recent controversy.

Last February the Board of Trustees of the University settled upon the personnel and the salaries of the faculties of the University for the scholastic year 1927-28. All of the faculty members so reappointed have signified their purpose to continue with the University except Professor Johannesen, who has resigned. Events, however, have transpired within the recent past which possibly may have caused some faculty members to change their minds and to prefer to sever their connections with the University.

There has been a controversy. That controversy has been heard and considered by the Board with all the care of which it is capable, and has been decided by it. The authority and duty to conduct the University is vested alone in the Board of Trustees, and it obviously cannot surrender this authority. But we do not mean to disregard the Deans and Faculties. We propose to see to the security of their dignity and the protection of their just prerogatives. Before the present controversy arose, the Board had already determined to seek outside expert advice as to a proper curriculum and as to various questions of administration. And this plan it expects to carry out.

The Board wishes every faculty member, who in good faith can and will accept the decision of the Board and cooperate with it and President Colvin, to remain on the Faculty and help build for our University a great future.

Such decision on your part does not imply the surrender by you of either personal dignity, academic freedom or the right to express, in a proper way and through proper channels, your opinions on University matters.

When the trouble and unrest in the Faculty, whatever its cause, became known to the Board, it invited full conference and free expression of opinion by every member of the two Faculties; and because it was fair and right to do so, it gave

its assurance that no one would be penalized for anything said in those conferences. That promise will be faithfully kept; but it does not cover the prolongation of a destructive controversy, after that controversy has been decided by the Board, in which the law vests the authority, and upon which it places the responsibility for such decision. That decision must be accepted as final. And the President, the Faculty and the Board should now work together harmoniously and whole-heartedly in the efficient performance of their respective duties, looking to the upbuilding and success of the University. If this cannot be done, then those individuals, whoever they may be, or whatever their place, that stand in the way of this end must step aside.

The Board assures you again that the written contracts which were offered to and have been signed by the faculty members were not designed to get rid of any member of the faculty now or in the future. We recognize the importance and desirability, from every standpoint, of continuity and stability in the status of the faculty members. And no changes will be made, except where the clear interests of the University require it.

The members of this Board, including President Colvin, who is one of the Board, have every desire to work harmoniously and sympathetically with the faculty. And we hope this feeling will be reciprocated. If, however, you conclude that you cannot do this, we ask that you advise us in writing to that effect on or before June 10, 1927. In default of hearing from you by that date we will assume that you intend to cooperate in the manner expressed above.

With best wishes, we are,

Yours very truly,

(Signed) JOHN W. BARR, JR.
HELM BRUCE
HARRY A. DAVIDSON
E. S. JOUETT
WM. HEYBURN
FRED W. KEISKER
J. C. MURPHY
ALFRED SELLIGMAN
W. S. SPEED
GEORGE COLVIN

Trustees

APPENDIX Q

Statement of the Board of Trustees, January 31st, 1927, regarding post-graduate and undergraduate work in the University of Louisville.

The University of Louisville is a municipal university. A large part of its revenue comes from taxes upon the people of this city. Its primary object, therefore, is to give the benefits of higher education, a university training, to the young men and women of Louisville, and thus to fit them for the work of life in competition with others who have had such advantages. This is what we are striving to do. And this, in our judgment, compels us to recognize that the needs of the great body of young men and women, who in the College of

Liberal Arts, compose the Freshmen, Sophomore, Junior and Senior classes, (in college language called 'undergraduates') are more important than the needs of a few graduates, who after graduation, desire to take advanced or postgraduate courses along some particular line or lines of investigation and research.

It must be understood, however, from what we have just said, that we have not, for a moment, considered lowering the standards of scholarship requirements in the University. On the contrary, it is our desire, and shall be our effort, to raise it. We have five colleges in the University, (1) Liberal Arts, (2) Medicine, (3) Law, (4) Dentistry, and (5) Engineering. In each of these colleges we are constantly striving to raise the standards, and in some—notably in Medicine—we have made great progress. All we mean by what we have said above on the subject is that if, on account of our limited finances, it becomes necessary to give preference in any particular as between the needs of the undergraduates and those of the postgraduates, we feel bound to give the preference to the former, of which, in the College of Liberal Arts, there are at present 742 as against 17 of the latter. As Dean Briggs of Harvard has said in substance, the development of a scholar is not a higher or nobler or more abiding work than the education of a man.

At the same time, with the approval of the Board, the following statement was submitted to Dr. Patterson, the Director of Graduate Work:

1. Our first obligation is to our undergraduate student body. Our courses should be organized, our equipment should be selected, our methods of instruction should be prepared to meet the needs of the undergraduate body.

2. Whenever the number of students in a class in the freshman or sophomore year demands it, the class should be divided even though to divide the class means to increase the number of classes that are required and to decrease the number of classes that are optional.

3. Students entering the College at the beginning of the second semester should be organized into separate classes. To organize such separate classes will inevitably mean either an increase in our faculty or a change in schedule for some of our faculty members by the abandonment of certain classes.

4. The interest of the faculty members in undergraduate courses, particularly in courses provided for freshmen and sophomores, should be just as genuine as it is or would be in graduate classes. And, so far as it is practicable, the strongest and the most experienced faculty members in any department should participate in the instruction of these undergraduate groups.

5. A conscientious, intelligent, and sympathetic effort should be made to prevent the all too large percentage of failures in the freshman and sophomore years, recognizing that these failures may be due to a lack of preparation on the part of the pupil, to a lack of capacity on the part of the pupil, and sometimes to a lack of sympathetic interest on the part of the faculty members themselves.

6. Unless undergraduate work is thoroughly and properly done, there can be no need for graduate work.

7. In the matter of equipment, it should be our first concern to secure equipment adequate to meet our undergraduate needs before undertaking to secure equipment demanded by graduate work. This should apply to laboratories and libraries.

8. There should be no discrimination of any sort against undergraduate and in favor of graduate students.

9. Having met conscientiously and intelligently our undergraduate needs, it should be our constant purpose and policy to engage in graduate work. To this end our departments ought to be so organized and our equipment so provided as to meet those needs.

10. Applicants seeking graduate work should be carefully and conscientiously selected to the end that graduate work may not be discredited. A teacher engaged for full time and carrying a full load and receiving a full salary cannot carry a full graduate study load at the same time. Either the work that the teacher is engaged to do will be neglected or the work required of him as a student will not be satisfactorily done.

11. We are not hostile to graduate work. On the contrary, we should encourage the development of this work in every possible way, provided always that its development is not at the expense of efficient undergraduate work.

APPENDIX R

"Proceedings of the Conference," pages 9 and 10.

President Colvin: May I make this suggestion, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Faculty: Inasmuch as all that I have is involved in this matter, and inasmuch as this is, as you have stated, a friendly conference, and inasmuch as every man and woman here tonight is capable of speaking for himself or herself, I insist that whatever statement is to be made on this matter, shall be made by the person who chooses to make it; that no man shall speak for another man, but each one of us shall stand on our feet and say what we want to say. I object to a digest being read of statements made by members of the Faculty under conditions other than these.

Mr. Selligman: I don't know what Dr. Fowler wants to state.

President Colvin: He wants to read a digest of the statements that they have collected from members of the Faculty. If my life is at stake in this matter, I shall insist that every man tell what he knows and what he thinks, and not have someone else say it for him.

Dean Anderson: I think the point President Colvin makes is not well taken. However, my choice of the word there, perhaps, is not a happy one. What has taken place is that an analysis of the various reports has been made by the Faculty. It simply analyzes it under different headings.

President Colvin: I think this Board is capable of analyzing any statements that may be made. They are the ones to render the decision. I think it is only fair to every man in the group to say exactly what he wants to say and that no one else say it for him. I would ask no more than that from any group if you were in my place.

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

BROWN UNIVERSITY. "KNOWING AND LIVING," A COURSE FOR FRESHMEN IN THE WOMEN'S COLLEGE.—A course whose purpose is to show the woman student how college is related to the larger world without its walls, and how a liberal arts training can fit her to take her place in society and in the home, was given for the first time during the last semester for the freshmen in the Women's College in Brown University.

"In recent years the women's colleges as a group have become increasingly conscious of the need of relating their students to their future adjustments as women in the world outside college walls," says Dean Morriss in explaining the purpose of the course. "While the students in the Women's College in Brown have the very great benefit of following the University curriculum, experimentation in courses particularly adapted to women must be made in some such extra-curricular way as this."

"The primary purpose of this course is to open to the students glimpses of the larger world in which they live and in which they will have to play their parts, and also to put before them the problems of the modern educated woman: what is her inheritance, what are her opportunities, what are the new adjustments to living which she will be called on to make, and in what way will the college training to which she is looking forward help in the solution of her problems, and give to her an added richness of living?"

Dean Morriss gave the first lecture in the course on "College and the Future." Professor Carl Barus, spoke on "Contributions of Science to the Life of Man;" Professor Albert D. Mead, on "Evolution in Biology;" Mrs. Bessie Bloom Wessel, Lecturer in Social Research in Brown, on "How Old Is Man?" and "Family Life, Past and Present;" Miss Margaret Davidson, Director of the Personnel Bureau in the Women's College, on "The Higher Education of Women, What Has Come of It?" Mrs. Eva Van Bauer Hansel, who has spoken and written much on child study and parental care, on "Wives, Mothers, and Education;" Professor Matthew C. Mitchell of the Department of Political Science in Brown, on "The Woman Citizen;" Dr. Charles A. MacDonald, a member of the psychiatric advisory committee at Brown, on "Human Beings;" Professor Will S. Taylor of the Department of Art at Brown, on "The Value of Art;" Mrs. Ernest B. Charbonnel, a distinguished

pianist, on "The Value of Music;" Mr. Sharon Brown of the editorial staff of the *Providence News*, on "Books as Life Teachers;" and Mrs. F. G. Allinson, formerly Dean of the Women's College, on "The Harmonious Life."

CHICAGO, INSTITUTE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—President Mason of the University of Chicago: "Some college will have the courage calmly to abolish the entire system of credit bookkeeping. What college it will be I can't say; it may be that the University of Chicago will be the one to do it."

"Some time in the future we may have a better idea of what education is all about, exactly what we are trying to do. We are trying to create a breadth of intellectual interest, to make students aware of the happiness and value that comes from knowing things and to find the beauty existing in the workings of the mind. A second important aim is to inculcate the technique of intellectual procedure in problem solving, for the idea must be accepted that life in any plane is an unending and continuous series of problems. Along with that goes the formation of the habit of general reading and general thinking."

"So long as we work on the assumption that the majority of students come to our colleges to resist education the students are going to play the game of instructor versus pupil; the game of learning versus getting credits. It will be an interesting day in education when it is recognized that students are not reciting to please their instructors. In place of the credit system, it might be better to substitute a comprehensive final examination on subject rather than course, and a series of personal reports from each student at the end of each term, which gave his own estimate of his intellectual progress."

"There seems to be too much factual content in the courses today; we try to give every bit of information possible. What is necessary is that we should inspire intellectual curiosity, and let the students find the facts themselves. The short-cut method of telling in phrases what it has taken man thousands of years of bitter experience to learn is dangerous. The lecture system is valuable only when it gives students an opportunity to see the way the lecturer's mind works, and gives contagion of interest. We should allow some of the joy of discovery to the student."

In the following discussion President Aydelotte of Swarthmore remarked:

"Perhaps as a natural result of an increase in numbers beyond the increase of intellectual facilities the instruction of the average American student has been standardized beyond the point where uniformity has value. The standardization has been carried to a point where it resembles the Federal Reserve System. If you have an academic record of certain courses in a certain recognized college, you can cash it in any other recognized college just as you can collect a check through any Federal Reserve bank. Our intellectual values could not possibly be represented correctly by this system. The registrar has become the criterion of culture.

"Swarthmore's plan to put the responsibility on the students, is based on the method of Oxford. At the end of their second year, undergraduates who have attained a certain intellectual and personal standard are allowed to volunteer to work for a degree with honors. Given a statement of the field which he must cover in his last two years, the student has the one job of covering the work in such fashion that he can pass a thorough examination at the end of his course. Required class attendance is eliminated, and the responsibility for acquiring an education is entirely on the student. Students who continue the ordinary way are given a degree without honors.

"I think the most important feature of the whole honor system is the fact that it puts the responsibility on the student. No matter how good our teaching may be each student must take the responsibility for his own education and the sooner he finds it out the better.

"There are nearly a hundred colleges and universities taking tentative steps in that direction. The movement is a kind of declaration of intellectual independence for the students, and the more thoughtful and independent undergraduates hail it with delight. It offers them an opportunity to go as far and as fast as they like in their studies, to work out their own intellectual salvation, and for that reason it is, in my opinion, one of the most hopeful educational signs of the present day."

Trustees Annual Dinner, to members of the Faculties.—"The tendency has been to place the financial and educational apparently in two somewhat separate compartments, and to develop the feeling that the Trustees alone are concerned with the material resources

of the University, and that the Faculty has no interest in the matter other than perhaps a selfish one. This feeling is not true in fact nor good in theory. The Trustees are deeply interested in the real work of the University; and a proper knowledge of the financial resources and condition of the University on the part of the Faculty is essential if they are to realize the justice of the budget appropriations. Some of the Faculty have vague notions of the wealth of the University and feel that the Trustees are unduly watchful in preventing the departments from getting what they desire.

"This might be obviated, I think, if an afternoon or evening session were held at the University once a year or oftener, at which the Trustee and administrative officers would present to the Faculty the financial situation of the University and answer questions regarding any phases of it which might not be clear. Such conferences, if conducted with frankness and good-will on both sides, would, I feel sure, be of much benefit to all concerned, by removing many possibilities of misunderstanding and cultivating mutual confidence.

"I offer a further suggestion in the interest of fuller cooperation and mutual understanding: that at least once a year the President of the University and the Faculty invite the Trustees to a meeting to present to the Trustees a report of what, in their judgment, is most significant in the work of the University, and what they feel should be the next step in its development; and that opportunity be afforded for frank and free discussion.

"My final suggestion relates to the personnel of the Board of Trustees. At present the members are, as previously mentioned, men of affairs, thoroughly competent to manage the funds of the University wisely. With this growing need for further cooperation between the financial and the educational aspects, it would seem to me that some persons might well be elected to the Board because of their wide experience in university education, men so conversant with the theory and practice of higher education, that they would be able to reinforce the President in presenting the educational policies and plans to the Board of Trustees.

"Another thing I would suggest is an annual meeting of each department or of each group of departments which now meet together. We have the monthly meetings, the journal clubs, those groups in which scientific discussion is carried on throughout the academic year. I am wondering if it would not be a wholesome thing if one of these meetings a year were turned into an annual meeting, and

within that group it should be a stock-taking meeting. The work of the past year would be surveyed and the work of the year to come would be outlined as far as that is possible. I know with what eagerness I should welcome, and I am sure all the administrative officers of the University would welcome, an opportunity to attend such a group meeting as that. I feel that it would satisfy a sound and wholesome internal need, the need of self-direction. Even in so small a group as a department, once a year is none too often to survey what has been done and to plan for the future. We have a great group of productive scholars within the University, and they must direct their own efforts. They cannot be directed, but they must direct their efforts in such a way that the maximum advance of knowledge will come from their activity."

PRESIDENT MASON, University of Chicago,
University Record, V. XIII, No. 2.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH.—In its *Bulletin* of March 7, 1927, interesting reports are made by the Committee on Educational Research on the following topics: "Student Personnel;" "The Marking System;" "Relation of Class Size to Efficiency of Instruction;" "Extra-Curricular Activities;" "Mental Hygiene of College Students;" "Teaching of Science." The nature of these reports is suggested by the two extracts which follow:

Marking System

"Upon this basis it is believed that these recommendations are valid:

"1. For the University as a whole, or at least for each college receiving entering freshmen, a basic group should be set in comparison with which all future marks should be determined.

"2. This basic group should be the entire fall freshman class in a given year and thereafter be constant for a period of time.

"3. A definite distribution of marks for any class typical of the entire freshman group should be officially established.

"4. Variations from this distribution should be justified at first by selection as evidenced by difference in intelligence levels or differences on the basis of other general ability tests.

"5. In the later quarters of work, an index for the students in any one class for any one quarter based upon the average of all previous marks should be the means by which the general level of the marks should be determined for that class.

"6. In order to make possible legitimate variation which may occur as a result of such things as superior teaching, special administrative devices, and any other elements which may operate in a single term, a consistent effort should be made to devise for courses objective tests which are general enough and comprehensive enough to be used with validity over a period of time. These tests could be used to indicate fluctuations in the level of achievement from one quarter to another and so set the general level of the marks but would not necessarily be used to decide the marks of individuals in the course. A set of equivalent tests of such a nature would make it possible to compare the student body over a period of time on the basis of achievement in definite subjects.

"7. The use of objective tests which lend themselves to the rating of individuals on the basis of percentile ranks or standard scores could eventually supplant the latter rating but this should occur only as comprehensive objective measures come into general use. In the meantime in order to allow for the growth of such a system supplementary space on the class report to the registrar might well be provided. Such space could allow for the S.D. scores or the P.R. and also provide for the designation of the group upon which the scores were based.

"A further point should be mentioned. Publicity of distributions of marks may do much toward gaining the interest of the faculty in securing uniformity. Questions which have been put to committee members by heads of departments and deans indicate both a desire for information as to the distributions of marks and a present lack of unavailability of such material."

Relation of Class Size to the Efficiency of Instruction.—"As one approach to the problem, the subcommittee on class size studied trends in class size over a six-year period since 1920. Though the average size of classes has remained about constant in some colleges and has even decreased in a few departments, the general tendency throughout the University has been toward larger teaching units. Classes in one college have more than doubled in size since 1920.

"In view of the frequent claim that large classes are not conducive to efficient student work, a comparison has been made of student marks in large and small classes in five populous courses from 1920 through 1925. In these five courses there has been practically no difference in the percentage of A's, B's, C's, D's, E's, failures, incompletes,

and withdrawals between large and small sections. In the only course showing a difference that might be considered significant the small sections had a higher percentage of failures than the large sections had. It appears that if small classes are more efficient the advantage is not revealed in instructors' marks.

"In addition to these investigations, the relative effect of large and small classes upon efficiency of instruction is being studied experimentally. Controlled experiments have thus far been concluded by seven instructors in six different courses in three different colleges. Ten instructors are now cooperating on other experiments, and a number of units have been arranged for 1926-1927. Some of the completed experiments have extended over five successive quarters. . .

"There may be no single solution to so complex a problem as that of class size. It may be that certain classes can be increased without loss whereas others cannot. It may be that the optimum size of class is different for different teachers and students. Possibly the aim or nature of the course will ultimately determine the ideal class size. Methods of teaching may have something to do with it. Physical conditions may be found to be the determining factor. On the other hand, classes at their maximum size under present methods of teaching and classroom management may be considerably increased under modified instructional or administrative techniques. It is therefore important that the problem be studied widely as well as thoroughly. Additional support has accordingly been given to the subcommittee with the request that it continue its researches in the hope that it may reach conclusions important to the administrative policies of the University. Interest in the question on the part of the faculty has already become so widespread and requests for experiments so insistent as to tax the facilities and resources of the committee."¹

ROLLINS COLLEGE, PROFESSORSHIP OF BOOKS.—At Rollins College has been established a Professorship of Books with Edwin O. Grover of Dartmouth as the first appointee. He will offer three courses: The History of Books; Literary Personalities; English and American Literature.

The purpose of these courses is suggested by President Holt: "These boys and girls do not come to us for the purpose of becoming

¹ [EDITOR'S NOTE—The sizes of classes studied varied from 22 to 62 students. Apparently no comparison was made between classes under 20 and those over 20.]

historians, or scientists, or even creative artists in literature, but for the purpose of acquiring a cultural background that will fit them for the higher walks of life; and of developing within themselves resources that will provide compensating pleasures against the wear and tear of our present-day commercial life."

Current Events, January, 1927.

SMITH COLLEGE, RESEARCH PROFESSORSHIP.—"The antithesis between teaching and research which is reflected today in many educational journals and on many platforms is a false antithesis," said President Neilson in accepting the chair of research bearing his name, which has been established at the college in honor of the tenth year of his presidency and which is to be occupied by Professor Kurt Koffka of Giessen. "So far from having an institution make up its mind whether it will teach or seek new truth," said President Neilson, "I do not think that it can teach effectively unless a large part of its faculty is interested in new truth and is participating in the search for it. It is my opinion that effectiveness of teaching, which I believe is our first interest here at Smith, is dependent upon the intellectual activity of the teacher.

"I do not believe that you will find a college teacher accomplishing the best results who is not interested in the progress in his or her particular field and is not following the research at the frontier. Nor do I believe that it is possible to follow research at the frontier without an impulse to take part in the work there, to experiment and find out for oneself.

"It is, therefore, an extremely gratifying choice which my friends have made in seeking to do me this honor, the choice of the establishment in our midst of a chair and laboratory which will be devoted to pure research, and research, I am led to understand, on a subject quite closely akin to teaching, namely problems in the psychology of learning. So far as I know there is no undergraduate college in America which has a chair devoted entirely to research. It may be a very important beginning. It may be a landmark in the intellectual life of the undergraduate college in this country."

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SELECTION OF A PRESIDENT.—The following statement has been prepared for the *Bulletin* by two of the three members of the Faculty Committee on Cooperation, the third member being absent from the city. The members of the

committee are Professors Edmond S. Meany, history, chairman, Leslie J. Ayer, law, and H. K. Benson, chemistry.

"In the selection of a new President of the University of Washington, the Faculty was given an opportunity of cooperating with the Board of Regents.

"When the offer of cooperation was accepted by the Board of Regents, it was clearly stated by them that conditions then pertaining might require an election independent of, or prior to, the extensive examination and report planned by the Faculty Committee on Cooperation.

"The Faculty expressed a strong desire that Acting President David Thomson should be continued in the office of President and that, of course, became the main portion of the Faculty Committee's report to the Regents. Acting President Thomson manifested a reluctance to assume the responsibilities of the office permanently and the Faculty Committee made a search through the leading American universities and thereupon recommended five outstanding educators as acceptable in case it would not be found possible to retain Acting President Thomson.

"Apparently the Regents found it difficult to arrive at unanimity until the plan was devised to offer the Presidency to M. Lyle Spencer, former Dean of the School of Journalism, and to retain Dean David Thomson and Dean F. M. Padelford as assistants to the Executive. The Faculty Committee promptly acknowledged the apparent wisdom of this solution of the problem and it is now believed that the University of Washington has been placed upon the plane of wholesome understanding and within the spirit of cooperation among the Faculty, the Executive, and the Board of Regents."

MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of seventy-nine members, as follows:

Agnes Scott College, Edith M. Harn, Elizabeth F. Jackson; **University of Arkansas**, W. B. Mahan; **Baker University**, Mary A. Lawrence; **University of Colorado**, D. J. Duncan, W. C. DuVall, J. A. Hunter, V. P. Lubovich, Edna Davis Romig; **Columbia University**, A. L. Jones; **Davidson College**, J. M. McConnell, D. R. McGrew, C. M. Richards; **Gettysburg College**, R. P. Marsh; **Georgia State College for Women**, J. L. Beeson; **Goucher College**, H. L. Kingsley, Fritz Marti; **Harvard University**, Oakes Ames, N. H. Black, C. W. Dodge, W. Y. Elliott, F. L. Kennedy, J. S. Pray, A. W. Scott, H. T. Stetson, H. H. Stevens, W. L. White; **University of Illinois**, Edward Berman, P. VanB. Jones; **Iowa State College**, C. H. Brown; **Lehigh University**, T. E. Butterfield; **Mt. Holyoke College**, Mary V. Braginton; **Mt. Union College**, Sarah C. Stevenson, Jean Wilson; **University of Nebraska**, G. G. Andrews, F. C. Harwood, Winifred Hyde, H. C. Koch, O. H. Werner; **University of New Hampshire**, J. O. Wellman; **Normal University**, Jennie Whitten; **University of North Dakota**, J. M. Reinhardt; **Northwest Missouri State Teachers College**, M. W. Wilson; **Ohio State University**, C. E. Anibal, C. M. Brown, B. R. Buckingham, R. S. Dewey, Frederick Horridge, F. N. Maxfield, B. A. Nash, Amalie K. Nelson, E. W. Pahlow, H. J. Peterson, Samuel Renshaw, J. E. Shepardson, V. T. Thayer, H. A. Toops; **University of Oregon (Portland)**, J. H. Mueller, **Princeton University**, E. A. Beller, T. M. Greene, K. P. Stevens, Willard Thorp; **University of Richmond**, W. A. Harris, Grace W. Lardrum; **College of St. Teresa**, D. F. Sheehan; **Stanford University**, J. H. Jackson; **Swarthmore College**, R. E. Spiller; **Temple University**, Minnie J. Merrells; **Texas Christian University**, E. R. Tucker; **Vanderbilt University**, Clyde Pharr; **Washington University**, F. H. Everhardt, Vladimir Jelinek, F. E. Long, Ernest Sachs, E. H. Wyerpel, F. L. Wright; **Washington and Jefferson College**, M. C. Waltersdorf; **Williams College**, J. W. Miller; **University of Wisconsin**, P. F. Clark.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and fifteen nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before November 25, 1927.

The Committee on Admissions consists of F. A. Saunders, Harvard, *Chairman*; W. C. Allee, Chicago; Florence Bascom, Bryn Mawr; A. L. Bouton, New York; E. S. Brightman, Boston; J. Q. Dealey, Brown; E. C. Hinsdale, Mt. Holyoke; A. L. Keith, South Dakota; G. H. Marx, Stanford.

Arch R. Addington (Geology), Indiana
C. O. Appleman (Biochemistry), Maryland
Sister Mary Aquinas (English), Rosary
H. H. Arnold (Romance Languages), Pennsylvania State
E. C. Auchter (Horticulture), Maryland
English Bagby (Psychology), North Carolina
Lucy A. Ball (English), Central Missouri
James P. Baxter (History), Harvard
J. G. Beard (Pharmacy), North Carolina
Donald M. Bennett (Physics), Louisville
W. S. Bittner (Sociology), Indiana
Hannah M. Book (Psychology), Indiana
Edward S. Boyer (Religious Education), Dakota Wesleyan
Edith C. Bramhall (History and Politics), Colorado College
John L. Buys (Biology), St. Lawrence
Winifred Mary Carmody (Romance Languages), Rosary
F. W. Clower (Economics), Washington State
W. A. Cogshall (Astronomy), Indiana
Raymond H. Coon (Latin), Indiana
Calvin Crumbaker (Economics), Montana
Mabel Davidson (English), Randolph-Macon Woman's
S. C. Davisson (Mathematics), Indiana
Herman J. Deutsch (History), Washington State
Theodore W. Douglas (English), Indiana
Mattie Dykes (English), Missouri State Teachers (Maryville)
Lionel D. Edie (Economics), Indiana

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

Oliver P. Field (Political Science), Indiana
F. R. Flournoy (History), St. Stephen's
I. O. Foster (Education), Indiana
Alexander D. Fraser (Classics), Alfred
Howard M. Fry (Physics), Franklin and Marshall
A. Leah Gause (Nature Education), Pennsylvania State
Eldon Griffin (Oriental Studies), Washington (Seattle)
Harry Gwinner (Mechanical Engineering), Maryland
Isabel Harris (Mathematics), Richmond
Annie Gardner Harvis (Foreign Languages), Central Missouri
Mayme B. Harwood (Art), Central Missouri
Julia Hatz (Home Economics), Chicago
F. E. Henzlik (School Administration), Nebraska
A. V. Hiester (Political and Social Science), Franklin and Marshall
Urban T. Holmes (French), North Carolina
Garth A. Howland (Fine Arts), Indiana
Pauline A. Humphreys (Education), Central Missouri
R. O. Hutchinson (Physics), Washington State
Elisha K. Kane (Romance Languages), North Carolina
Ralph J. Kaufmann (Chemistry), Louisville
M. S. Kharasch (Chemistry), Maryland
Alice L. Kibbee (Biology), Carthage
Florence B. King (Home Economics), Indiana
Alfred C. Kinsey (Zoology), Indiana
W. E. Knickerbocker (Romance Languages), City of New York
Albert L. Kohlmeier (History), Indiana
W. F. Kumlien (Rural Sociology), South Dakota
E. V. Kyser (Pharmacy), North Carolina
Paulus Lange (English), Iowa State
E. Francis Laverio (Romance Languages), Richmond
Hedwig G. Leser (German), Indiana
Arthur B. Leible (English), Indiana
Donald S. Libbey (Agriculture), Drury
Roy P. Lingle (English), Swarthmore
Susan M. Lough (History), Richmond
David R. Major (Philosophy), Indiana
Charles T. McCormick (Law), North Carolina
Douglass S. Mead (English), Pennsylvania
P. L. Mellenbrush (Education and Psychology), Wittenberg
Charles E. Meyers (English), Franklin and Marshall

- L. J. Mills (English), Indiana
Mark C. Mills (Economics and Sociology), Indiana
Louise B. More (Sociology), Hamline
Miron A. Morrill (English), Hamline
Clara E. Morris (Household Science), Georgia State (Women)
George E. Nelson (Library), City of New York
J. N. G. Nesbit (Mechanical Engineering), Maryland
L. R. Norvelle (English), Indiana
Howard R. Omwake (French), Franklin and Marshall
Paul L. Palmer (Education), Chattanooga
Harry J. Patterson (Agriculture), Maryland
Emily C. Pennock (Romance Language), Carthage
F. W. Prouty (Geology), North Carolina
George W. Pucher (Biochemistry), Buffalo
Agapito Rey (Romance Languages), Indiana
R. R. Rosborough (Latin), Duke
Lulu L. Runge (Mathematics), Nebraska
Laura L. Runyon (History), Central Missouri
Else M. Saleski (Modern Languages), St. Lawrence
Clara Sinclair (Education), Dakota Wesleyan
Joseph L. Snider (Business Statistics), Harvard
Axel Skjerne (Music), Indiana
Carl Stephenson (History), Wisconsin
S. G. Stoltz (Chemistry), St. Catherines
J. Elmer Switzer (Geology), Indiana
W. T. L. Talioferro (Farm Management), Maryland
F. W. Tilden (Greek), Indiana
A. Marie Todd (English), Central Missouri
J. A. VanKirk (History), Dakota Wesleyan
Arthur Wald (Languages), Drury
James R. Wallin (Social Science), Missouri State Teachers (Maryville)
W. E. Weisgerber (Chemistry), Franklin and Marshall
C. E. Wells (History), Missouri State Teachers (Maryville)
Maurice H. Weseen (English), Nebraska
C. C. Williamson (Library), Columbia
R. T. Wyckoff (German), Berea
Hayes Yeager (English), Ohio State
Herman H. Young (Psychology), Indiana
Harvey A. Zinszer (Physics), Mississippi State (Women)